



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 015 569 200

205
A5123



LELAND • STANFORD • JUNIOR • UNIVERSITY

ANNEX

ANNEX

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS, RT. REV. MGR. J. F. LOUGHLIN D. D., REV. JAMES P.
TURNER AND MR. JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas
vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.
S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXVI.
FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1901.

PHILADELPHIA :
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

124310

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1900,
By BENJAMIN H. WHITTAKER,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at
Washington, D. C.

Y8A9811
80811.0807A72 08A.131
Y71281V811

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Anglo-Saxon Missionary Methods—Bryan J. Clinch.....	243
Apennines, An Old-Irish Monastery in the—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.....	436
As Others See Us—W. F. P. Stockley.....	278
 Burns, C. S. C., Rev. James A. Catholic Secondary Schools....	 485
 Campbell, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Legal Tenure of the Roman Catacombs.....	 147
Cardinal Mermillod—T. L. L. Teeling.....	757
Catholic Features in the Official Report on Education—J. J. O'Shea	125
Catholic Secondary Schools—Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C....	485
Catholicity in Detroit, Two Centuries of—Richard R. Elliott....	499
China, The Western Powers and—Bryan J. Clinch.....	4
Clinch, Bryan J. Anglo-Saxon Missionary Methods.....	243
Clinch, Bryan J. The Western Powers and China.....	4
Clinch, Bryan J. The Work of the Philippine Commission....	625
Collectivism, The Principle of—Rev. William Poland, S. J.....	53
Common Prayer, The First and Second Books of—Very Rev. W. Fleming.....	338
Commonwealth, The Irish Policy of Cromwell and the—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.....	20
Coupe, S. J., Rev. Charles. The Temporal Power.....	776
Crispi, From Silvio Pellico to Francesco—John J. O'Shea.....	798
Cromwell and the Commonwealth, The Irish Policy of—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.....	20
 Detroit, Two Centuries of Catholicity—Richard R. Elliott.....	 499
Divine Element in Scripture-Revelation—Rev. Charles F. Grannan, D. D.....	353
Doctrinal Subterfuges, Royal Oaths and—John J. O'Shea.....	417
Dowling, B. A., A. E. P. R. The Greek Temples in Sicily.....	694
 Education, Catholic Features in the Official Report on—John J. O'Shea	 125
Eleusis, The Mystic Rites of—Daniel Quinn.....	742
Elliott, Richard R. Two Centuries of Catholicity in Detroit....	499
Encyclical "De Jesu Christo Redemptore".....	163

	PAGE
Encyclical "Graves de Communi"	374
Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy, Saint—Very Rev. E. Maguire, D. D.	317, 523
Evolution by Natural Selection, The Rise and Fall of—Rev. S. Fitzsimons	87
First and Second Books of Common Prayer, The—Very Rev. W. Fleming.	338
Fitzsimons, Rev. S. The Rise and Fall of Evolution by Natural Selection	87
Fitzsimons, Rev. S. The True Critical Test of Natural Selection.	559
Fleming, Very Rev. William. The First and Second Books of Common Prayer.	338
From Silvio Pellico to Francesco Crispi—John J. O'Shea.	798
Galileo Galilei Linceo, Il Dialogo di—F. R. Wegg-Prosser.	266, 453
Ganss, Rev. H. G. Luther and His Protestant Biographers.	582
Glancing Backward on the Road—Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, D. D.	1
Grannan, D. D., Rev. Charles P. Divine Element in Scripture-Revelation	353
Greek Temples in Sicily, The—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A.	694
Harnack and His Critics on the "De Aleatoribus"—Rev. G. H. Joyce, S. J.	675
Il Dialogo di Galileo Galilei Linceo—F. R. Wegg-Prosser.	266, 453
Irish Monastery in the Apennines, An Old—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.	436
Irish Policy of Cromwell and the Commonwealth, The—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.	20
Joyce, S. J., Rev. G. H. Harnack and His Critics on the "De Aleatoribus"	675
Joyce, S. J., Rev. G. H. The Source of Moral Obligations.	41
Justinian the Great (A. D. 527-565)—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.	209
Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. W. J. The Laborer and His Point of View.	108
Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. William J. The Socialism of the Socialists.	468
Laborer and His Point of View, The—Rev. W. J. Kerby, Ph. D.	108
Legal Tenure of the Roman Catacombs—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D.	147
Luther and His Protestant Biographers—Rev. H. G. Ganss.	582

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
Maguire, D. D., Very Rev. E. Saint Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy	317, 523
Maynooth, The Second Plenary Synod of—Rev. M. O’Riordan, D. D., D. C. L.....	136
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. The Irish Policy of Cromwell and the Commonwealth.....	20
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Spencer’s Philosophy.....	643
Medicine, Microbes and—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.....	287
Mega Spelaeon, or the Monastery of the Great Cave—Daniel Quinn	70
Mermillod, Cardinal—T. L. L. Teeling.....	757
Merrick, S. J., Rev. D. A. The Supernatural.....	733
Michael Servetus and Some Sixteenth Century Educational Notes—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.....	714
Microbes and Medicine—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.....	287
Missionary Methods, Anglo-Saxon—Bryan J. Clinch.....	243
Moral Obligations, The Source of—Rev. G. H. Joyce, S. J.....	41
Mystic Rites of Eleusis, The—Daniel Quinn.....	742
Natural Selection, The Rise and Fall of Evolution by—Rev. S. Fitzsimons	87
Natural Selection, The True Critical Test of—Rev. S. Fitzsimons.....	559
Old-Irish Monastery in the Apennines, An—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.....	436
O’Riordan, D. D., D. C. L., Rev. M. The Second Plenary Synod of Maynooth.....	136
O’Shea, John J. Catholic Features in the Official Report on Education	125
O’Shea, John J. From Silvio Pellico to Francesco Crispi.....	798
O’Shea, John J. Royal Oaths and Doctrinal Subterfuges.....	417
O’Sullivan, S. J., Rev. D. T. Scientific Chronicle. 185, 396, 613, 819	
Papal Supremacy, Saint Ennodius and the—Very Rev. E. Maguire, D. D.....	317, 523
Pellico to Francesco Crispi, From Silvio—John J. O’Shea.....	798
Philippine Commission, The Work of ‘he—Bryan J. Clinch....	625
Philosophy, Spencer’s—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.....	643
Poland, S. J., Rev. William. The Principle of Collectivism.....	53
Principle of Collectivism, The—Rev. William Poland, S. J.....	53
Protestant Domination Over Weak Communities—James E. Wright	538

	PAGE
Quinn, Daniel. Mega Spelaeon or the Monastery of the Great Cave	70
Quinn, Daniel. The Mystic Rites of Eleusis.....	742
Revelation, Divine Element in Scripture—Rev. Charles P. Grannan, D. D.....	353
Rise and Fall of Evolution by Natural Selection, The—Rev. S. Fitzsimons	87
Roman Catacombs, Legal Tenure of the—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D.....	147
Royal Oaths and Doctrinal Subterfuges—John J. O'Shea.....	417
Ryan, D. D., Most Rev. P. J. Glancing Backward on the Road. I	
Saint Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy—Very Rev. E. Maguire, D. D.....	317, 523
Schools, Catholic Secondary—Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C....	485
Scientific Chronicle—Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J. .185, 396, 613, 819	
Scripture-Revelation, Divine Element in—Rev. Charles P. Grannan, D. D.....	353
Second Plenary Synod of Maynooth, The—Rev. M. O'Riordan, D. D., D. C. L.....	136
Servetus and Some Sixteenth Century Educational Notes, Michael—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.....	714
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. An Old-Irish Monastery in the Apennines	436
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. Justinian the Great (A. D. 527-565)	209
Sicily, The Greek Temples in—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A.....	694
Socialism of the Socialists, The—Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph. D..	468
Source of Moral Obligations, The—Rev. G. H. Joyce, S. J.....	41
Spencer's Philosophy—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.....	643
Stockley, W. F. P. As Others See Us.....	278
Supernatural, The—Rev. D. A. Merrick, S. J.....	733
Teeling, T. L. L. Cardinal Mermillod.....	757
Temples in Sicily, The Greek—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A.....	694
Temporal Power, The—Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J.....	776
True Critical Test of Natural Selection, The—Rev. S. Fitzsimons.	559
Two Centuries of Catholicity in Detroit—R. R. Elliott.....	499
Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., James J. Michael Servetus and Some Sixteenth Century Educational Notes.....	714
Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., James J. Microbes and Medicine.....	287
Wegg-Prosser, F. R. Il Dialogo di Galileo Galilei Linceo.	266, 453

Western Powers and China, The—Bryan J. Clinch.....	4
Work of the Philippine Commission, The—Bryan J. Clinch.....	625
Wright, James E. Protestant Domination Over Weak Com- munities	538

BOOKS REVIEWED.

	PAGE
Apologetik als Spekulative Grundlegung der Theologie,— Schmid	624
Beati Petri Canisii, Epistulae et Acta—Braunsberger.....	414
Bible and Rationalism, The—Thein.....	616
Biblische Studien—Bardenhewer.....	416
Breviarium Romanum.....	832
Day in the Cloister, A—Von Oer.....	617
Dictionary of the Bible—Hastings.....	202
Dionysii Cartusiani Opera Omnia	205
Divinity of Christ, The—Bougand.....	201
Exposition of Christian Doctrine.....	409
Faith and Folly—Vaughan.....	621
General History of the Christian Era, A—Guggenberger.....	618
General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures—Gigot...	202
Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst—Kraus.....	622
Geschichte der Weltliteratur—Baumgartner.....	623
Great Supper of God, The—Coubé.....	620
Historical Memoirs of the City of Armagh—Stuart.....	206
History of America Before Columbus—De Roo.....	200
History of the Diocese of Hartford—O'Donnell.....	623
History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages— Janssen	196
History of the Jesuits in England, The—Taunton.....	614
Holy Year of Jubilee, The—Thurston.....	204
In the Beginning—Guibert.....	613
Institutiones Metaphysical Specialis, Psychologia—De Backer .	829
Institutiones Philosophiae Moralis—Castelein.....	829
Institutiones Theologicae Dogmaticae—Einig.....	414
Jesuit Relations, The.....	198, 411
Last Years of St. Paul, The—Fouard.....	206

	PAGE
Law and Policy of Annexation, The—Randolph.....	415
Meditations on Psalms Penitential.....	831
Meditations on the Life of Jesus Christ—Ilg.....	412
New Raccolta, The.....	415
Orestes A. Brownson's Latter Life—Brownson.....	205
Philosophia Lacensis—Meyer.....	407
Political Economy—Devas.....	619
Psychology—Maher	203
Scale of Ladder of Perfection, The—Hilton.....	622
Short Lives of the Dominican Saints.....	413
Sister Mary Gonzaga Grace, Life of—Donnelly.....	199
Some Notes on the Bibliography of the Philippines—Middleton.....	195
Synodorum Archidioeceseos Neo-Eboracensis.....	832

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVI.—JANUARY, 1901—No. 101.

GLANCING BACKWARD ON THE ROAD.

THE first quarter century of our existence closed with the last October issue. Therefore it is fitting that we should offer a few words as to the sentiments with which the occasion inspires us, as we look back, not without a certain sense of solemnity, on the wreck of years and the work accomplished, as well as the monumental urns which stand by the dim wayside. The hands that first presented the work to the world—saintly and capable hands, both cleric and lay, they were—are mouldering in dust; but their spirit survives in the intellectual organism which they called into being, animating it with undiminished zeal and desire in the prosecution of those high aims and ideals which formed the original inspiration.

When making its first bow before the world of learning this "Review" modestly but clearly defined its mission and its message. Its mission it declared to be to provide a vehicle for the highest thought which should be distinctively American as distinctively Catholic. To that definition it has rigidly adhered all these twenty-five years. More than once it has been suggested that the word "American" was injurious because suggestive of limitation. But this idea is illusory. In practice, the pages of the "Review" are open, and have been always open, to the whole world of Catholic thought. Nor has it excluded non-Catholic thought when this was presented by

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

minds made generous by that search for truth which distinguishes the conscientious student from the wavering and irresolute votaries of the midnight oil. Because it is proud of the country of its birth and its institutions, and proud of the progress which under these our indestructible Church has made, the editors stood firm in the resolve that this pride should find recognition in official title of their publication.

Rightfully, the exposition and defense of Catholic truth held the first place in the opening announcement of objects contemplated. To Philosophy and Science, as handmaids of religion, when not taken out of their proper atmosphere, due place was also assigned. To the muse of History, in its relation, especially to the Catholic Church on the American Continent, it was proposed to pay due honor. These were some of the intentions outlined in the first note of salutation. Since then the widening of the programme was seen to be necessary, for the development of the social propaganda and the birth of new ideas in many fields of thought and action have directed literary energies into channels hitherto undreamed of. All these topics have been discussed by the ablest hands in the "Review," concurrently with the unfolding of doctrinal truth and the patient investigation of its truth by the keen eyes of the ecclesiastical archæologist.

"We are not without misgivings, either as to the arduous nature or the probable success of our undertaking." So said the distinguished scholar who wrote the introductory lines; but he solaced himself for this incertitude of mind by remembering the line of the Umbrian lyrist:

"In magnis et voluisse sat est."

This almost Divine encouragement was indeed the great vivifying inspiration of the original founders, and it was rewarded by the addition of success beyond the utmost hope. The "Review" has had its fluctuations. It has had its prosperous periods—prosperous beyond all early anticipation—and its times of stagnancy, when it reflected in some measure the vicissitudes of fortune in the affairs of the nation at large.

Politics in the ordinary sense were excluded from the purview of the "Quarterly." But the ethics of politics, as the signatory observed on assuming control of the magazine, ten years ago, demand attention, because "when great moral questions are involved in political issues the illumination of sound principles must fall on the dark places and show men that the right alone is the truly expedient."

Great liberty of expression of opinion has been permitted, as announced in the Salutatory written ten years ago and published on the

first page of the "Review" in these words: "Contributors to the 'Quarterly' will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the 'Review' not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

The idea of the "Review" may be attributed to the late Monsignor Corcoran. His great intellect led him to aspire to more for the literature of Catholicism than had been as yet attempted by any publication in the United States. He found a ready and responsive coöperation at the hands of the publishers of its predecessor, the *Catholic Record*, Messrs Charles A. Hardy and Daniel H. Mahoney. Down to the time of his lamented death Mr. Hardy continued to be the publisher of the magazine; and it is only just to say that his personal enthusiasm in the work all through had no small share in the determination of its success. Since his demise the responsibility for the magazine's production has devolved upon our own shoulders. The most trenchant and erudite pens that the Catholic world could boast of have constantly been impressed into the service of the Church, on this high plane of ambition, ever since the "Review" was ushered into the world. Monsignor Corcoran, its first editor, was a host in himself. He wrote much for its pages. Orestes Brownson, John Gilmary Shea, George Dering Wolff, Rev. Augustus Thebaud, S. J., Right Rev. James O'Connor, D. D., Rev. Edward McGlynn, D. D., Right Rev. T. A. Becker, D. D., Right Rev. P. N. Lynch, D. D., T. W. Marshall, LL. D.—these are a few of the names to be encountered in the pages of the very first number. Among the succeeding contributors are such names as those of Cardinal Gibbons, Cardinal Manning, Archbishop Keane, Archbishop Seghers, Bishop Spalding, Bishop Chatard, Bishop Walsh, Very Rev. Augustine Hewit, Monsignor Seton, Very Rev. John Hogan, S. S., D. D., Rev. Dr. Bouquillon, Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, Rev. Edward Pace, D. D., Rev. Dr. Zahm, Brother Azarias. These are only a few, picked up at random; but they will serve to show the class of aspirants which the founders of the magazine attracted to the cause on the announcement of their design to produce on the American Continent a Review of the highest order in a literary point of view—for which Seneca might possibly be too heavy and Plautus certainly too light—a work intended not to pass an idle hour in the boudoir, but to help the scholar by his lamp and the theologian in his study.

P. J. RYAN.

THE WESTERN POWERS AND CHINA.

THE outbreak in China has come on the close of the nineteenth century as suddenly as the French Revolution came on the eighteenth. There is a strange likeness between the early stages of the European convulsion and the events now passing in Asia. In each case the oldest Government of a continent has been suddenly assailed by revolution within and invasion from abroad. In each attempted reforms of society on theoretical principles have resulted in outbursts of savage ferocity among populations regarding themselves as civilized for many centuries. A year ago political economists were planning the transformation of China by railroads and modern machinery as, in 1789, philanthropists and savans urged the reconstruction of Europe on the theories of humanitarian science. In neither century did the would-be reformers reckon with the wishes or sentiments of the populations affected by their projects, and in both the populations have shown that old habits and thoughts are not to be changed with impunity by self-sufficient rulers.

The plans of social reorganization in China have not been confined to outsiders. Men like Li Hung Chang and the reigning Emperor have been for some years trying to introduce the science and political ideas of the West into the Middle Empire under the patronage of despotic power and for its benefit. In a similar way Catherine of Russia and Frederick of Prussia undertook to mould their governments on the philosophy of the encyclopedia. Despotic monarchs were as eager for social and religious changes as the French advocates of the rights of man, and, when power was thrown into their hands, the latter showed themselves as despotic in forcing their own ideas on others as either King or Emperor. The Taiping rebellion in China showed a similar spirit in the nineteenth century in Asia.

European and American theorists seem to have taken it for granted that the Imperial Government is all powerful over the Chinese population. It has only to concede privileges to foreigners, and the Empire may be moulded at will to the interests of trade and capital. In point of fact, the Chinese, during the nineteenth century, have been more turbulent than the populations of Europe during the first eighty years of the last century. In Paris popular disturbance had been unknown since the days of Mazarin and De Retz. In England no popular insurrection had occurred during the eigh-

teenth century. In Spain and Germany the case was almost the same. The duty, or necessity, of submission to the existing governments was recognized by the population at large in every European country down to the French Revolution. If it seems to be equally so in China to-day there is no more assurance that the sentiment will continue if the public feelings are thoroughly excited than there was in France before the storming of the Bastille.

Indications are not wanting of a change in the impulses of the Chinese people similar to that which occurred in the France of Louis and La Fayette. They are found both in the Government and in popular outbreaks. Prince Tuan, the leader of the Boxers, has a striking resemblance to the regicide Duke of Orleans of the Revolution. The wavering action of the Chinese Court, now applauding, now denouncing the "anti-foreign" rioters, recalls the later Ministers of the unfortunate French monarch while his authority was still recognized in name as head of the government. The fraternization between the regiments of the royal army and the Paris rioters seems to have been repeated between the Imperialist soldiers and the Boxers in Peking.

Atrocious as may have been the outrages committed by the Asiatic revolutionists, it should not be forgotten that even worse cruelties attended the progress of revolution in France. The butchery of the Ice Tower at Avignon, the wholesale drownings of Charries at Nantes, where men and women were tied together, in so-called Republican marriages, and sunk by hundreds in the Loire, the massacres at Lyons, at Toulon and a hundred other places, were as savage and far more extensive than any outrages lately reported from China. The slaughter of priests in the Abbey Prison of Paris was greater than that of all the missionaries slain in China in our own days. In Paris, the capital of European civilization, mobs tore men and women to pieces in blind fury and paraded the streets with the bleeding heads of their victims carried on pikes to the strains of music. The daughter of the Marquis de Cazotte, called to drink a bowl of human blood as the price of her old father's life, is as horrible as anything told of Chinese brutality. When human passions are let loose from moral restraint, no difference in savagery can be found between European, Asiatic or American man, between civilized society or barbarism. The Chinese mobs hack their Christian countrymen in pieces as "foreign devils," the civilized pagans of old Rome burned their Christians as "enemies of the human race," the Jacobin disciples of reason piked or shot Catholic priests as "foes of liberty," the Gordon rioters of London murdered Catholics as idolators. In deeds of cruelty the Chinese are not sinners above other men, and barbarity is confined to no race or time.

The intervention of the foreign powers as a consequence of the Boxer outbreak is another parallel between the France of the eighteenth century and China of the nineteenth. Even before the deposition of the King, the Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia combined at Pilnitz to suppress by arms the revolution in France. Prussian and Austrian armies invaded its territory under claim of defending the common rights of society and royalty. A Prussian army attacked Verdun as the European fleets attacked the Taku forts, in the alleged interests of order. From Coblenz the Duke of Brunswick, as commander-in-chief of the allied invaders, issued his famous proclamation threatening Paris and all other French towns with military execution unless they at once restored their King to his former absolute power. The manifesto has a remarkable resemblance to the speech of the present German Emperor to his troops when sailing for China. The injunction to avenge the death of the murdered Ambassador by a wholesale slaughter of Chinese is, indeed, more truculent than the "military execution" threatened by Brunswick. In politics the nineteenth century cannot boast of any ethical development between Brunswick and Kaiser Wilhelm.

The attack on revolutionary France was as unanimous as the late campaign against China. Austrian, Prussian and Sardinian armies invaded France in 1792, while Louis was still in name its constitutional King. On his execution England and Spain, as well as Russia, Sweden and Holland, joined in the attack. The motive alleged for this remarkable unanimity of usually hostile States was the suppression of anarchy in France, in the interests of European society. The excesses that had been committed by the revolutionary party when Brunswick's army entered Champagne were wholly confined to Frenchmen on French soil. The invading powers claimed an international right to enforce the continuance of monarchy in any country, as modern Imperialists claim the right to take over the government of dark-skinned peoples. The "white man's burthen" is but the "sacred rights of monarchy" under a new name.

The result of the German invasion on France was only to increase the violence of the revolution a hundredfold. The deposition of the King, the massacres of the Paris prisons, the establishment of the National Convention of Robespierre as the supreme authority and the execution of Louis followed in quick succession. Marat demanded two hundred and sixty thousand heads of aristocrats as a public necessity, and urged the organization of bands of murderers to accomplish it quickly. The churches were closed and the "Goddess of Reason" worshiped on the altar of Notre Dame. Three hundred thousand "suspects" filled the jails of France, and their numbers were daily thinned by the action of the guillotine. The

Reign of Terror was called into existence by the foreign invasion more than any other cause.

To the politicians of outside Europe it looked as if this condition of affairs left France at their mercy. Civil war was raging. La Vendée, Lyons, Toulon, Caen and a number of other cities took up arms against the Paris Convention. The national army had been demoralized by the recent events, and especially by the banishment or execution of nearly all its officers as suspected aristocrats. The Treasury was bankrupt, the administration in the hands of mob leaders without experience or training, the magazines empty of supplies and the population divided between the traditions of order and loyalty and the new republican ideas. The occupation of Paris and the conquest of France seemed as easy a task to the wise men of Berlin and London in 1793 as the conquest of China appears to-day to modern Imperialist eyes. Plans for the partition of its territory, of course in the interests of humanity, were put forward as freely as they now are in China's case. Austria wanted Alsace and French Flanders; Sardinia, Provence and Dauphiny; England, Corsica and the French colonies. A restored Bourbon might be left to rule the rest of the country under the armed protection of the other European powers.

The first progress of the invasion seemed to promise realization of these projects. Fifty Austrian hussars chased an army of French levies at Wisemburg; the Prussians captured the strong fortress of Verdun, so famous in the late Franco-Prussian war, almost without loss; the Sardinians and Spaniards marched unopposed into the French territory. There was wild panic in Paris. The Convention decreed a levy of three hundred thousand men and afterwards called every man between eighteen and twenty-five to immediate service. But there were neither arms nor ammunition to supply the means of defense; even clothing and shoes could not be found for the recruits. The sea was in the power of the hostile nations. The steel of Sweden and the nitre needed for powder making were both cut off by the war. Famine, too, was raging in France. The crops had been ruined between political disturbance and bad weather, and English and Dutch cruisers blockaded the ports and seized all vessels bringing the provisions of America to the starving nation. All the resources of civilization seemed combined in the hands of the allies against the distracted French people. The military discipline of the Prussian army under Frederick was as efficient as it was in our time under Von Moltke. Rosbach, thirty years before the Revolution, was as decisive a victory of Prussians over French soldiers as was Sedan since. With such a force at his disposal against the raw levies of Republican France, it is not strange that the march to Paris

was regarded as little more dangerous than a military promenade. The whole population of France was only twenty-five millions. The nations combined against her disposed of a hundred and twenty millions. They controlled the sea and commerce as well as the capital of the world. Numbers, military organization, wealth and trained political intelligence were overwhelmingly against the French Republic.

They all failed to win success. Whatever the different views of Frenchmen on republicanism or monarchy, towards Jacobins or Girondists, the great majority felt that defense of their native land against invasion was their first duty. A flame of enthusiasm blazed through France and made the whole nation an army. The smiths were all impressed to make muskets, the tailors uniforms. All materials needed were seized wherever they could be found. Nitre was extracted from the mortar of cellars and the recruits were armed. Royalist officers, though liable to lose their heads as aristocrats at any moment, drilled the new levies and led them to victory. Dumouriez repulsed Brunswick at Valmy and saved Paris. The check was little more serious in effect than that which the allies met in their first advance towards Pekin, and was as little regarded at first by the invaders; but other lessons of war's uncertainties came thick and fast. Men from the ranks like Hoche and Pichegru took command of armies and defeated the veteran generals of Germany. The retired royalist officer, Dugommier, raised a force in the south which drove back the disciplined Spanish troops and invaded Spain. At Jemappe and Hondscote, at Fleurus and at a score of other battles the new levies scattered the best armies of Germany and England. Within a few months after Valmy the Austrians had been driven out of their own territory of Belgium, and Holland was overrun and its navy captured by French cavalry while embedded in the ice of the Texel. The fortune of war was not, indeed, all on one side, and defeats like those of Neerwinden and Mayence came to vary the victories of the French armies; but within two years the heads of the European governments recognized that the conquest of France was beyond their power. Spain made peace in 1795 and Prussia the same year. Holland had been conquered, the King of Sardinia driven from his own capital. The English had seized Toulon, the chief naval station of France on the Mediterranean. They had also invaded Corsica, under protection of their fleets. They were driven from both. Napoleon won his first distinction at the recapture of Toulon as a captain of artillery. Within four years he had conquered Italy and dictated peace to the German Emperor at Leoben. The European coalition had collapsed. Its members had made war to prevent the establishment of republican

The Western Powers and China.

institutions in France. Their efforts had resulted in surrounding a republican France with a border of dependent republics formed from the territories of its assailants. The Batavian, the Ligurian, the Cisalpine and the Parthenopean Republics had replaced the Stadtholder of Holland, the Kings of Sardinia and Naples and the German rule in Lombardy.

While defending their soil against invasion the French people had also put down the anarchy of the Jacobin faction in Paris. Robespierre had been overthrown and guillotined, after eighteen months of executions, and a Directory set up in his place. Napoleon had crushed a last rising of the anarchists before setting out to conquer Italy. Within four years more he had become absolute master in the new republican France. As First Consul and Emperor he became master of that Europe which had projected the partition of France ten years earlier. Austria, Russia, Prussia and Spain saw him in their capitals as a victorious invader. Kings of his family reigned in Spain and Holland, in Naples and Westphalia. A French general became Crown Prince of Sweden. Such was the result of the combination of Europe to regulate the government of the French people a hundred years ago. The lesson seems worth study at present.

The course of action of the different allied powers with regard to one another is also worthy of consideration. Setting out with proclamations of disinterested zeal for the maintenance of public order and international law, each power, in the course of the Revolutionary struggle, showed itself as unscrupulous in its acts as the French Jacobins. Prussia and Russia enslaved Poland the very year that Louis XVI. died on the scaffold. When the French made Holland a republican government England seized the African colonies of its late ally. Prussia, a little later, tried to make its own of Hanover from England. Austria accepted the Venetian territories from Napoleon as a compensation for the loss of Lombardy. Russia annexed Finland from Sweden because its boundary was too near St. Petersburg. England kept Malta from its legitimate rulers because it had been occupied by Napoleon on his voyage to Egypt. Nelson bombarded Copenhagen and seized the fleet of Denmark with no excuse except that Napoleon might do likewise. The twenty-two years, from Valmy to Waterloo, which followed the Convention of Pilnitz for intervention in France, were marked with more blood and international lawlessness than any century of European history. More than any other cause the policy of intervention of Leopold and Frederick William was responsible for this. Does the new principle of the "White Man's Burthen" offer better prospects in practice?

It hardly seems so. There is little in modern political history to indicate that any higher moral principle rules the governments of our day than those of the last century. England is annexing the Transvaal with as little pretext of right as Catherine of Russia and the Prussian King had for the dismemberment of Poland. Her power is checked for intervention in China precisely in the same way as Russia was at first hindered from active part in the invasion of France in 1793. The seizure of Kiao Tchou by the German Emperor was as flagrant an outrage on international right as Russia's occupation of Finland. The parallel between the King of Sweden, murdered by one of his own subjects when setting out to put down anarchy in France, and Humbert of Italy, similarly slain, while his soldiers were slaying Chinese to restore order in that Empire, is a very striking one. If lack of moral principles worked disastrous results among governments a hundred years ago, there seems reason to anticipate similar results from like causes now.

The recent history of most of the powers now engaged in restoring order in China gives little guarantee that the undertaking will be carried out with any more honesty among the partners than was the old coalition against France. The Italian Kingdom owes its origin to conquests of a character simply piratical. The invasions of Tuscany, of Parma, the Papal States and Naples were made without even pretext of right. The seizure of the African territory which forms the Italian colony of Erythræa was of a similar nature. The invasion of Schleswig, of Hanover and Hesse by Prussia showed equal disregard of national rights. The cynical hypocrisy of a government which refuses its own subjects the right to reside in Germany, if they belong to Catholic religious orders, and demands that China shall be invaded if she refuses protection to Catholic missionaries on her soil may be remarked.

It is scarcely different with France. Her late seizures of Tunis and Madagascar showed equal disregard of right with Prussia's occupation of Schleswig. England's occupation of Egypt, because a part of its people attempted to substitute European methods of government for Turkish despotism, is a copy of the policy which attempted to restore absolute monarchy in France last century. The conquests of Burma, Uganda and the South African republics are equally lawless. Russia's advance in Asia is of the same kind as the invasions of Timur or Mahomet II. There is small likelihood that regard for moral right or public opinion will sway the decisions of any of these powers in the disposal of China. The "ethical development" of the nineteenth century of Spencer and Huxley promises even less fruit than the doctrines of Rousseau and D'Alembert in the eighteenth. Indeed, the list of public violations of national rights

by the armed hand of power is far longer in the later century than in its predecessor.

How slight the chances are that half a dozen allies will unite harmoniously in a scheme of plunder, history teaches us from the last century. It was from experience of the European coalition that Washington left to his countrymen his solemn warning against "entangling alliances" with any foreign power. Its observance saved America from being drawn into the Revolutionary struggle which devastated Europe for twenty-two years, which began with a Reign of Terror of anarchists and ended with a Holy Alliance of absolute monarchs.

The part which China itself may take in the struggle is still harder to anticipate. At the present her people seem helpless against modern war, with its scientific weapons and careful discipline; but France seemed scarcely more likely to successfully resist the armies of Europe when Brunswick issued his famous proclamation. The last twenty-five years have given ample illustration that in war the unexpected is always liable to happen. Modern discipline and arms did not save the Italian army from crushing defeat by the warriors of Abyssinia nor the British-led Egyptians under Hicks Pasha from annihilation by the Dervishes. The Boer war, where two hundred thousand British soldiers have been needed to conquer a population of three hundred thousand all told, is a still more striking instance of the uncertainties of war, even under modern conditions. The possibilities latent in the four hundred millions of Chinese are enormously greater than were those in the twenty-five millions of Revolutionary France. That the people have little of the military spirit of Western nations at present is true, but it is no guarantee that it may not be awakened in them as in other men by aggression carried too far. The Taiping rebellion and the Black Flags of Southern China are hints that the fighting spirit is not wholly absent from Chinese nature. The Russians to the time of Peter the Great were as little regarded as soldiers by their European neighbors as the Chinese to-day. A King of Sweden, in the eighteenth century, scattered fifty thousand of Peter's best troops with eight thousand Swedes at Narva. The same monarch traversed the whole of Russia as a conqueror with forty thousand men. The Russian peasantry to-day are as peaceable and scarcely more advanced in civilization than in the days of Peter, but the best soldiers of the world, from Frederick of Prussia to Napoleon, have found conquerors in the once despised Russian armies. The Mongol tribes, now a part of the Chinese Empire, have entered Europe as conquerors at least three times in modern history. The dominion of Kublai Khan and his successors for two centuries reached from the Yellow Sea to the Dnieper, and

the Princes of Russia had to seek their investiture with power in a Tartar camp. It seems not impossible that the descendants of the old conquerors may learn the use of arms again as readily, at least, as the Russians have done already.

The permanent supremacy of the white race in the world, or of civilized over uncivilized man, are facts commonly assumed, but not borne out by the experience of the past. Nations of European race are strongest in the world to-day, as they were in the days of Augustus or Theodosius; but in the intervening centuries there were many in which the sceptre was held by others. The tribes of Arabia in sixty years built an Empire greater than the Roman and including half of its former dominion. The Turkish Sultan and the Great Mogul in the sixteenth century were superior in power to any European State. Francis I. of France and Elizabeth of England begged the alliance of Solyman the Magnificent in terms that seem incredible to French or English pride to-day. Higher civilization made Greece the conqueror of Persia under Alexander and made Rome supreme for three centuries over the wild tribes of Germany and Africa; but in the Roman Empire, as in Asia, the turn of the barbarians to conquer civilization came in due course. A skin-clad savage from the Baltic, scarcely different from one of our own Iroquois of the last century, took place in Rome of the last Cæsar. A band of Turkoman shepherds from the steppes of Tartary have for four centuries occupied the imperial city of Constantine. One cannot see grounds for the assurance that similar changes are now impossible.

The material power of the European race was concentrated in the Roman Empire as it has never been concentrated since. It represented the highest civilization and culture as well as the greatest military power of the world for nearly six hundred years. If independent nations or tribes continued to exist around its frontiers, it was only because the domestic policy of the Roman Government desired no further territory. From Marius to Theodosius no rival State rose to dispute the supremacy of the Roman. One government ruled France, Spain, Great Britain, West Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Turkey, South Russia and the whole north of Africa. In all these lands there were no more national rivalries than exist among the different States of the American Union to-day. Roman law and Roman language, Roman schools and Roman military discipline were the common possession of York and Alexandria, of Morocco and Cologne. The tribes outside her borders were scarcely more important than the Creeks or Shawnees to the Republic of Washington. The Parthians of the East were not more formidable than Afghanistan to-day is to the

Indian Empire, and the known world showed no other power even the equal of Parthia in military strength. A Roman of the days of Constantine might, not unreasonably, hold the supremacy of his race and civilization was a natural law of human nature. He could look back four hundred years to Sylla and Marius and find Rome, even then, dominant over all rivals and already old in a career of victory over Greek and Carthaginian, over Gauls and Asiatic monarchs. Compared with such a duration, what have any of the civilized powers of our time to show? Russia as a European power only begins with the eighteenth century. The whole foreign Empire of England is no older. The French Republic, by the widest reckoning, cannot date beyond the Revolution. Austria began with the nineteenth century in her present form. The German Empire and the Italian Kingdom have each but thirty years' existence. Our own United States has a hundred and eleven years of its present Constitution. Judged by the test of time, the present predominance of the European race in the world is almost as brief in comparison with the Empire of the Cæsars as the dominion of Napoleon in France beside the old Bourbon monarchy. Yet Rome crumbled and her Empire passed away within a half a century of the death of Theodosius. A savage chief ruled in the Imperial City as its King before the end of the fifth century, and other hordes divided the provinces of the civilized world at will. Neither higher civilization nor military science could preserve the European race from foreign conquest fourteen hundred years ago. They hardly promise better guarantees to it to-day from the successes of three centuries.

The collapse of the Western Empire was mainly a triumph of barbarian over civilized man among European races. Goths and Vandals, Burgundians and Lombards were of the same Caucasian race as Romans, Greeks or Celts. But the revolution then begun did not end with the substitution of Frank or Gothic Kingdoms for Roman Cæsars and prefects. From the deserts of Arabia a power was developed by Mahometanism which, within sixty years, conquered the largest half of the territory of European civilization and held it for fully a thousand years under various forms. The Arab Caliphs made the whole of Roman Africa and Western Asia as well as Spain and Sicily part of their empire, which for two centuries was the greatest in the world. When the Saracen power crumbled its place was taken by other Asiatic conquerors, Turk or Mongol, with undiminished power. From the eighth to the fifteenth century the domain of the European races was steadily diminished by the tide of Asiatic conquest. Christian Russia became a province of the Mongol Khans in the twelfth century. The Balkan Peninsula fell under the rule of the Osmanli in the fifteenth. In the sixteenth cen-

tury Sultan Solymán was the foremost ruler in Europe, and up to 1683 no Christian land, once conquered, had ever been recovered from Turkish rule. The Russian Czars paid regular tribute to the Khan of the Crimea, himself but a vassal of the Sultan. Indeed, it is barely a hundred years since our own United States paid a tribute of sixty thousand dollars annually to the Dey of Algiers to escape the seizure of American vessels by the Algerine Corsairs. European ascendancy seems rather too recent a growth to warrant assured confidence in its permanence even now. Mahometanism had nine hundred years of victory and ever growing territory before her decline came.

Civilization is an elastic term and very differently understood by different races. The Chinese are as fully convinced of the superiority of their own institutions and culture as the most enthusiastic Anglo-Saxon or German Imperialists of their own call to take up the "white man's burthen." It must be admitted they are not wholly without justification in their ideas. The population maintained by the soil of China is denser than that of Europe and equals the wealthiest individual European countries in that respect. The political convulsions of the last fifteen hundred years have been far more destructive of human life and material progress in Europe than in China. Wars of conquest have been, as a general rule, avoided by successive Chinese Governments during all that time in spite of the preponderating power placed in their hands. The action of the Emperors of China towards their weaker neighbors of kindred races, towards Annam, Corea, Burmah and Japan has been more equitable on the whole than that of any great European power during the last three centuries. The government, however corrupt, is one of law rather than brute force, and the length of its duration is a fair argument that the good in the system outweighs the evil. In spite of the denser population in China, the material comfort of the people is greater than in India under Anglo-Saxon rule. Famine, though not unknown, does not recur with the terrible regularity of its appearance in British India, and has never, we believe, attained the intensity of the Irish famine of 1848 under the present Queen's reign. Neither is the public action of the Chinese authorities marked with the cynical disregard of human suffering that has been too often expressed by European rulers, and in theory, at least, the obligations of the rulers towards the people are fairly recognized in China.

In some points we cannot but notice that the Western nations have been adopting as social improvements institutions in vogue for over a thousand years in the Chinese Government. During the nineteenth century the growth of democracy has been one of the

most marked movements in European civilization. In China there is no privileged class of nobles. The offices of government are filled by examinations almost on the principles known in this country as Civil Service Reform. With all its materialism, the Chinese race has a high regard for intellectual culture, and the tests applied for its recognition are not widely different from those of European schools and colleges. This must, in fairness, be considered in deciding on the real human value of the Chinese system of civilization. That it is imperfect, that the laws are not formed on European models or always honestly administered may be conceded without therefore concluding the whole system unfit for existence. We are not confident that the general administration of the laws in our or any other land is above reproach, or that any of our systems of government does not need improvement, yet we claim the title of civilized men. We may grant as much to the Chinese.

With all its jealousy of foreigners it is but fair to admit that during the last three centuries the Chinese Government has treated the Catholic missionaries and their converts with less intolerance than most non-Catholic European States. The year in which the first Jesuit missionary entered China was marked in England by the execution of Father Cuthbert Mayne with worse than Asiatic tortures on the sole charge of being a Catholic priest. In 1599 the Italian Jesuit, Ricci, was allowed to settle in peace at the Chinese capital and teach his religion to any who chose to hear him. During those seventeen years nearly two hundred persons, priests and laymen, had perished on English scaffolds for profession of the Catholic Faith. A Chinese Christian was first Minister of the Emperor.

At this time, in Sweden, profession of Catholicity was a capital offense, as in England was the reception of Catholic orders. The penal codes of both countries lasted for more than a hundred and fifty years later.

There has been a congregation of Catholic Chinese with Bishops and priests and churches and schools in Peking since the beginning of the seventeenth century, as well as many others through the Empire. The Chinese Christians and their teachers have undoubtedly been often persecuted and many of them executed for their religion by the tribunals, but neither in duration nor violence has Chinese intolerance of Christians equaled English intolerance of Catholics. There have been Catholics in England during the whole existence of the Penal Laws. The year 1583, in which the first Jesuit missionary entered China, was marked in England by the execution of Father Cuthbert Mayne, with atrocious tortures, for the crime of being found in the dominions of Elizabeth as a Catholic priest. At the close of Elizabeth's reign, twenty years later, over two hundred

persons, priests and laymen, had been executed for profession of the Catholic faith alone. At the same time a European Jesuit was President of the Board of Mathematics in the capital of China, and congregations of Christians had been formed there and in half a dozen other Chinese cities. Thirty years later a Chinese Catholic, the celebrated Paul Siu, was Grand Colao, or Prime Minister, of the Empire, and two other Catholics were Presidents of Supreme Courts and another Viceroy of Lao Tong. The Jesuit Father Schall was employed during twenty years in revising the Chinese calendar, and on his death an elaborate monument was raised to his memory in the name of the Emperor himself. The Mantchu conquest made no change in the policy of the Chinese Government in this respect. Catholic priests continued to direct the Imperial Academy of Astronomy in the time of Napoleon. In 1811 there were four large Catholic churches in Peking and over three hundred thousand Catholics scattered through the Empire. The Chinese Christians and their missionaries had indeed persecutions to endure from time to time. The Emperor Kea Kin in the present century deported four Bishops and thirty priests to Canton and threatened death to the teachers of Catholicity and exile to its professors. There were numerous local persecutions at different times by Viceroys and Governors as well as outrages by fanatical mobs, but Chinese history shows no such persecutions as marked the annals of Japan in the seventeenth century, or Corea or Annam in our own. The intolerance which makes the abandonment of Mahometanism a capital crime in every Mahometan State finds no parallel in China with all its dislike of foreign ways. Under many of the Emperors Catholic converts attained the highest offices, while in Russia to-day renunciation of the national creed entails perpetual banishment, and in England to the close of the eighteenth century it involved loss of property as well as political rights.

With these facts before us we are not warranted in describing the Chinese as more intolerant in religious matters than Western races have shown themselves to be. The Government is not Christian, but scarcely a Western nation professes to be guided by Christian principles in its policy to-day. The attitude of most of them towards the Catholic Church is scarcely more favorable than that of the Chinese Court, and often far less so. Within the last twenty-five years the Catholics of Germany and Russia were deprived for an indefinite time of all their Bishops, and the exercise of Catholic worship was penal to any priest not licensed by the agents of the Government. If the lives of missionaries and Christian converts have been sacrificed at times by mob violence in China, similar events are not unknown in our own land. The burning of the Ursuline

Convent at Charlestown and the persistent refusal of the authorities of Massachusetts either to compensate for the injury or punish the rioters is as flagrant an instance of lawless brutality as any that can be set against the Chinese Government or people.

The necessity of protecting the different missionaries who are spreading through China in the name of religion is a plea that is sometimes used to justify the aggression of foreign powers. The gross hypocrisy of this motive on the part of infidel governments is too patent. Germany and Russia to-day will not allow a Catholic Jesuit or members of various other Catholic orders even to enter their dominions. With what face can the representatives of these powers demand of China a toleration for foreigners which they refuse not only to foreigners, but to their own subjects? As far as the winning of the Chinese people to Christian belief is concerned, which, after all, is the only motive for true missionary work, this interference of national governments in a work outside their sphere is far more likely to hinder than to further it. From the time of Father Ricci down to a few years ago the Catholic priests, who were the only missionaries in the Empire, accepted the chances of toleration or persecution from the Chinese Government. They tried to conciliate the authorities, as the Irish and English Catholics of the last century strove to win toleration from the English Government, but they made no call on their own governments, even when Catholic ones, for protection. Father Perboyre and Father Clet were executed seventy years ago by the Chinese tribunals, but the French Missionary Society made no appeal for reprisal or even protection. It would seem that a continuance of the same course offers the best hope for the conversion of China. If its people refuse Christianity, the loss is their's, but their refusal gives no warrant to Christians to force the Gospel on them at the bayonet's point. Conversion must be free or it is valueless.

Neither morality nor the interests of Christianity call for the violent destruction of the existing Chinese Empire. The material interests of the world at large are scarcely less opposed to such a course. That an enormous disturbance of men's minds and economic conditions must follow is certain. What the result may be, if Asia should be stirred to fighting fury, as France was in the last century by the coalition of monarchs, passes calculation. We can no more foretell it than the Duke of Brunswick could foresee Napoleon and Jena when issuing his Coblenz proclamation to the French people.

That the European troops can put down any armed resistance that the Chinese Government can now offer seems morally certain. Since the first English invasion in 1840 the Chinese soldiery has

Vol. XXVI.—Sig. 2.

been almost ludicrously unequal to meeting Europeans in battle, and the late war with Japan showed little comparative advance yet made by them. But that fact does not show that the Chinese are incapable of learning the trade of the modern soldier any more than the others of Western civilization. The long despised Russian peasantry learned to become the foremost troops of Europe in ten years of defeat at the hands of the Swedish Charles. The Chinese may learn similarly, if the system of nagging and aimless warfare is continued indefinitely, or if a skilled head assume efficient control of their government. Asiatic nature is as capable of change and even of sudden revolution as European.

For centuries Japan had been more hostile to European ideas than China itself, while she regarded China as the model nation for government and culture. It is hardly thirty years since the Mikado's government undertook to introduce the science of the West to its people. Yet to-day, in China, the Japanese troops have been recognized as at least the equals of the best soldiers of Europe and America in every military essential. That immobility is not a characteristic of Asiatics is proved by the experience of Japan. There seems no grounds to believe it distinctively Chinese more than Japanese. The population of China is about ten times greater than Japan's. The position Japan, with ten times her actual population, would hold in the world is a suggestive consideration. The population of China equals the whole European race combined. The Asiatic races outside the Empire—Hindoos, Annamites, Siamese, Burmans, Turks, Persians, Arabs and Tartars—make up as large a population as China has. The last forty years have seen projects of German unity and Italian unity realized. Panslavism is being put forward as a more formidable combination for realization in the near future. A union of Asiatic races is not a remote possibility even now. It has been formulated already by Russian public men. Prince Uchtomski, in a recent work published in St. Petersburg, asserts there is scarcely any difference between Siberian and Chinese life, and he adds: "Few Western Europeans have any idea of what the steady advance of Russia across Asia means. We have blended with the Asiatics on the ground of common feelings and common ideas. This accord, on the most vital questions, makes it easy for us to deal with them. We prize absolute monarchy as our greatest treasure, and the peoples of all Asia have the same reverence for its idea. We are true Asiatics to-day."

Russia, in fact, has always been as much Asiatic as European in her national character and policy. "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar" was the old expression of the fact formulated by Napoleon. The original Duchy of Moscow was for two hundred years

a tributary of the Khans of the Golden Horde. The Grand Dukes had to journey to Mongolia during that time to receive authority only over their Slavonian subjects. When the Russians shook off their dependence as the Mongolian power broke down, three-fourths of what is now European Russia was occupied by Tartar races. The Finns, who stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea, were the first race amalgamated. The Tartar Kingdoms of Kasan and Astrakhan were conquered in the sixteenth century by John the Terrible, but for a hundred and fifty years later the south of Russia was subject to the Tartars of the Crimea, themselves vassals of Turkey. All these have been long absorbed in the Empire of the Czar, and are officially described as Muscovites, but the Asiatic blood and disposition still remains even among the natives of European Russia.

The Russian advance in Asia has no parallel in the English conquest of India or in the stream of colonization across this continent. It is a combination of both systems. The Tartars of Khiva or Turkestan, the Circassians of the Caucasus, the Kalmucks of Siberia have been conquered, as the Mahrattas were by Wellington or the Sikhs by Gough; but when conquered, they have been enrolled in the ranks of their Russian conquerors on an equal footing. When Skobeleff was marching towards Merv, in Central Asia, twenty years ago, his advance was formed of Mahometan Circassians, who, themselves, had only submitted to Russia twenty years earlier. A few months later Russian troops came into collision with the Afghans at Pendjeh. The general commanding was a Turkoman chief, who, with a commission, had received the Russian name of Alikhanoff. The present Governor of Poland is the Circassian Prince Imeritinski, whose father was an Asiatic chief. A late Chancellor of the Empire and one of the most famous Russian generals veiled their native Armenian names of Melikan and Lazaran under the European forms Melikoff and Lazareff. Men of Asiatic and European origin are mingled in every part of the administration of Russia, and members of the proudest Russian nobility boast of their Tartar blood. Prince Uchtomski's assertion is strictly true. Russia is as much, if not more, Asiatic than European.

What effect the Asiatic feeling of brotherhood will have on the policy of Russia and Japan at the present crisis in China is not to be easily settled. That any prolonged combination of the invading powers will exist seems more than unlikely. Like the confederated monarchs of the coalition against republicanism in France, each is guided solely by private selfish interests, and the result is likely to be the same. Neither France, Italy nor Austria, and still less America, has any prospect of gain from the dismemberment of the empire even could it be effected. The German Emperor's ambition for an

empire beyond the sea may lead him to urge war, and even to seize more territory on his own responsibility; but the good-will of his Russian neighbor is too important a factor in his policy to be overlooked. England's military power has been tried to an unexpected length by the resistance of the South African Republics to conquest, and she can afford no army to cope with the problem of an invasion of China. Her power is crippled for the time, as that of Prussia was occupied in the last partition of Poland while Napoleon was forming the armies that a few years later were to lay her prostrate at Jena. In the meantime the continuance of hostilities without definite object or principle of justice threatens serious danger to the world at large. The plunder of Tientsin and Peking, the atrocities already committed on thousands of unarmed peasants in the pretended interests of civilization have carried modern warfare to the methods of barbarism. At least they give us an idea of the cynical brutality of the work so unctuously styled taking up the "white man's burthen" by the cant of the day.

B. J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

THE IRISH POLICY OF CROMWELL AND THE COMMONWEALTH.

FOR practical purposes we might hold that the Republic was merged in Cromwell, but we shall endeavor to take his presence and the views expressed by all who had taken part in the war against the King and the overturning of the monarchy that the Republic was a real constitution of which Cromwell was at first the most influential military officer and subsequently the supreme Magistrate. The *Intelligencer*, the official or quasi-official organ of the Commonwealth, in its issue announcing that Cromwell was about to lead an army to Ireland, gives a curious challenge to the Marquis of Ormond:¹ "Have at you, my Lord of Ormond; if you cry Cæsar we cry a Republic; at the same time promising that he will have foes to encounter, to defeat whom will be a feather in his cap, and if defeated by them he will sustain no loss of reputation." This is a valuable sidelight in view of the effect aimed at in Carlyle's edition of the "Letters and Speeches of Cromwell." Carlyle wishes it to be understood that the state of things in Ireland defies the

¹ James Butler, twelfth Earl of Ormond, had been raised to a marquissate. Later on he was made a duke.

human intellect to grasp. Mr. Morley, evidently referring to the passage, observes: "It has been said that no human intellect could make a clear story of the years of triple and fourfold distraction in Ireland from the rebellion of 1641 down to the death of Charles I. Happily it is not necessary for us to attempt the task. Three remarkable figures stand out conspicuously in the chaotic scene." These are Ormond, Owen Roe O'Neil and the nuncio Rinuccini. We think this very disappointing on the part of Mr. Morley, who sees somewhat clearly that the events of that time, the war and the social relations established at that time, constitute the Irish question in its various aspects during two centuries and a half. We are glad to recognize that he looks upon the condition of political and social relations then set up as containing within themselves the elements of disintegration. We go the length of saying that the condition of affairs then brought about in Ireland was an anarchy. We miss from it every element of order and of right. There was not even the "order" that one might expect in a country newly planted with soldiers among the remnant of a people spared to be their servants. Martial law was the criminal jurisprudence, and the civil law—or rather the control of private interests and claims—was in the jurisdiction of commissioners whose statutes and precedents were their own discretion. Such discretion is what a great judge called the law of tyrants.

Beginning the chapter entitled "Cromwell in Ireland," Mr. Morley, we think, very fairly says that it is not enough to describe one who has the work of a statesman to do as "a veritable heaven's messenger clad in thunder." Such descriptions since the publication of Carlyle's biography have been doing their work of steeping intellect and conscience in a kind of lethargy. It is hard to understand how a man so balanced in mind and consistent in principle, to whom difficult problems of government have come for solution and whose maxims of policy approach to the Catholic ethic more nearly than those of any man except his illustrious chief, Mr. Gladstone, would allow himself to sink into the sort of lotos-eater's trance begotten of the strange harmonies and discords of Carlyle. We shall examine the evidence for the events, declining to take the latter's estimate of authorities for the very sufficient reason that he is utterly unable to deal with evidence. Mr. Morley is too gentle in suggesting that this passage or that savors of rhetoric. We say rhetoric, like "the creature wine," is good when not abused, but with Carlyle it does duty for fact, for argument, as well as for morality. In this paper we direct ourselves against Carlyle; for the philosophy of hero-worship in which he finds the rules of conduct for Cromwell and which is the standard by which this atrocity or that is to be vin-

licated or explained away is the "misbirth" of his own morbid intellect.

Mr. Morley, with an air of criticism, quotes a passage for which we shall find a significant parallel, but the criticism is almost apologetic. He is like an advocate who has the court against him and which he tries to bring round by hesitating insinuation. The court in this instance is the Anglo-Saxon race, or, if you like it better, the English-speaking world. Mr. Morley is an able and honest gentleman, and quotes the following from Carlyle as if there were something in it: "I could long for an Oliver without rhetoric at all; I could long for a Mahomet whose persuasive eloquence with wild flashing heart and scimitar is: 'Wretched mortal, give up that; or by the Eternal, thy Maker and mine, I will kill thee! Thou blasphemous, scandalous Misbirth of Nature, is not even that the kindest thing I can do for thee, if thou repent not and alter in the name of Allah?'" Mr. Morley's censuring this dithyrambic of ferocity is a soft hint that such sonorous oracles do not escape the guilt of rhetoric.

Let it be read in connection with the insane outburst with which Carlyle meets the possible denial of a statement for which he has no authority except Ludlow, whom he himself denounces as a valueless one. The statement in Ludlow's *Memoirs* that the garrison in Drogheda was mostly English is accepted by Carlyle as "absolutely certain" because it suits him. So he goes on in his superior manner, threatening vague penalties if Irishmen dare to question this absolute certainty: "To our Irish friends we ought to say likewise that this garrison of Tredah consisted in good part of Englishmen. Perfectly certain this; and therefore let 'the bloody hoof of the Saxon' forbear to continue itself on that matter. At its peril!" Then follows something like a promise of a Cromwell visitation. Well, the Irish peasant has a phrase, "The Curse of Cromwell!" in which he concentrates his sense of a calamity beyond the power of language to express. At the thought of it his mind is a blank with regard to all other horrors. The wars of Elizabeth, living in the cold and pitiless pages of Spenser and Carew to chill the heart and appal the mind, have no place in the national memory in the presence of the later horror. Whatever has happened since, the famines of two centuries, by which time can be dated as by Olympiads are shadows, the penal laws are a mere party cry at an election, the land war and the incalculable misery of evictions phases of a social crisis, the dragooning of '97 and '98, in comparison with which the raids of Claverhouse were the sports of children, is only a holiday inspiration; but the Curse of Cromwell is an inheritance of woe to which every child is born in Ireland.

We shall try to give the true aspect of Cromwell and the time;

we shall give it as a protest against the notion that strength, success and wealth are superior to morality; and, above all, we wish to attempt it because the political interests and the reputation of Irishmen are involved in the matter. Were it not for such considerations we should not think of marring the intellectual jubilee of the English-speaking world, synchronizing though it does with a manifestation of imperialism over the grave of Gladstone. It would be impossible to deny to Cromwell some of the qualities which belong to greatness. His rise in life, to which we shall allude by and by, could not have happened without certain moral and mental gifts superior to the common. As surely as Napoleon laid hold of and controlled in his own interests the passions let loose by the French Revolution, so surely has Cromwell seized on and guided those the Great Rebellion unchained in England. But we cannot see in him a commanding intellect entrusted with an eternal mission any more than in Attila, any more than in those destroying meteors from the East which filled the world for the brief span of a life, leaving nothing behind but blood and ashes. In some sort of way Mr. Carlyle looks upon him as a northern god with the hammer of Thor in his hand. It is true it fell with crushing force on Ireland; it fell on Scotland also. We are very much of opinion that in neither country would he have ground opposition to powder were it not that there were circumstances of fatuity, overwrought zeal, unwisdom and jealousy, which fought as the stars fought against Sisera. In Ireland there was the additional misfortune that at the moment Ormond seemed disposed to honestly avail himself of the military talents of O'Neil, that officer was on his deathbed.

While not agreeing quite with Mr. Morley's opinion of Ormond, we are far from accepting Carlyle's implied judgment that he was not a man whose statements could be relied on. Any statement of bare fact coming from him is trustworthy. He was an honorable man in his way; he was the most splendid gentleman of his time; he had civil talents of a high order, but we think he was totally devoid of military talent. His coming back to Ireland in 1648-9 was unfortunate. His double-dealing had ruined the country; but taking the supreme command as the King's viceroy over men who had so many grounds for distrusting him, and not possessing the training and experience necessary for successful operations against the greatest general produced by the Civil War in England, could have no effect but that of ineffectual resistance to the splendidly appointed army of Cromwell.

We put aside the hazy notions about this struggle which recent writers adopt from the pronouncement of Carlyle already cited in this article. It is so easy to shelter oneself under a plea of the im-

possibility of unraveling the evil, and by this acquiring the privilege of ventilating theories and inventing facts, that writers of a certain kind are tempted to pursue that course. Your mind is the mill and your inner consciousness the tender of the raw material. The fact is the vast information to be had from Carte's "Life of James Duke of Ormond" would of itself enable one to follow the whole war in Ireland from 1641—Mr. Morley's figure—until its termination in 1653. Carte, who is by no means friendly to the old Irish, who for that matter looks at everything with the eyes of Ormond, is described by Carlyle as "Jacobite Carte." Why? Simply because he puts the deeds of Cromwell in their genuine colors. It must be recollected that we are Christian men, now judging men brought up in a Christian land, who executed the dictates of a policy of extermination two centuries and a half ago on a people professing the Christian religion and who were not one whit less civilized than their fellow-subjects in England. We mentioned Ormond. Take him as a representative of the nobility of the Pale. All the praise Mr. Morley can give his statesmanship and character we can give to his externals—to whatever comes under the head of manner and equipage and to his character in those passages where his idolatrous king-cult did not interfere to warp his judgment. In his progresses from his seats to Dublin Castle six carriages and six accompanied him, and with these an escort of gentlemen of his own name, a dozen servants out of livery belonging to good families, a little army of servants in livery. His valet had orders to lay out a fresh suit of silk or velvet each day. This was when he was a young man in Ireland. Very little after he was the greatest figure at Whitehall. When we have him in 1649 he was a pauper, but with the thirty pistoles he brought from the Continent as his military chest he did not despair of his master's cause.

Take a representative of the old Milesian nobility. The Earl of Thomond's state was hardly in any respect inferior to Ormond's. We have the authority of a foreigner for the statement that his parks, gardens, castles and so on were not surpassed in Europe. He speaks of one deer park as containing three thousand head, we think in 1646, when the pinch of the long war must have been sharply felt by men in all conditions of life. Thomond was a colorless sort of magnifico, unable to take sides either with the Confederate Catholics or with the King, but that he was a great prince there can be no doubt, if for no other reason, because his terrible Protestant kinsman, Murrough of the Burnings, who looked up to no one else, looked up to him. If one reads the accounts of the proceedings at Kilkenny he can only arrive at one conclusion, that the Catholic lords and commons and the Catholic bishops assembled

there were able and educated gentlemen with a high sense of public duty and a conception of political morality rare not merely then, but which is now to be found only in a few instances in Britain—in Mr. Morley himself and, much as we differ from him, in Mr. Arthur Balfour and one or two more. Now we submit that the slaughtering of men of this kind² and the transplanting of them with adjuncts of incredible suffering, the shipping them off to the Barbadoes, the extremes of military violence offered to their wives or sisters or daughters, sons, children of all ages, even to the infants, “lest nits should become lice,” we submit deeds of this kind must be judged not as though Cromwell were a Mahomet ranting at “scandalous Misbirths of Nature,” but as an Englishman of the seventeenth century exercising unlimited power over the lives and fortunes of his countrymen.

There is too much of this factitious use of measures, this history-book handicapping of men, principles and events. Why should James of Ormond be declared “incapable of pardon,” though he was a Protestant? Why the Lord Primate Bramhall? Why should every Protestant bishop, dean, archdeacon and dignitary? Mr. Morley does not seem to have reflected on these points, though we admit his principles of toleration compel him to condemn Cromwell’s murdering of Irish priests and friars, and he does so on the same ground as he would the killing of Protestants by Catholic authorities. But the omission of this feature in the tyranny of the Commonwealth or its agent or master, Cromwell, is unfair. The ferocity of Cromwell was an ingrained or inborn instinct to which the gloomy fanaticism of his sect, fed on the bloody commands and examples of the Old Testament, gave a half-believed-in, half-doubted-of sanction. The inexorable and scheming policy wrought out in the death of Charles I. is in its own chamber of psychological study a crime portentous like the massacre in Drogheda. The point we have in view is that there is an abnormal cruelty like Cromwell’s, or like that of the more desperate Cameronians, which, while seemingly tinged with insanity, is the instinct of a savage egotism. There was something of it in Napoleon’s shooting of the Duc d’Enghien in the fosse of Vincennes, a great deal of it in the murders of the best and noblest in Rome by those emperors who are the fables of history. The persons in whose blood others would shrink from imbruing their hands would be the selection of those egotists. Now like to that eclecticism in morbid ferocity we hold is Cromwell’s universal, indiscriminate massacre of soldiers in cold blood and non-combatants without regard to age or sex. It is a ferocious vanity.

Accordingly, we are disposed to regard the “veritable Heaven’s

² Knocking on the head is Cromwell’s own phrase.

messenger clad in thunder" as the vulgar and brutal ruffian he was looked upon by his contemporaries, who were certainly as good judges as Carlyle. Is contemporary judgment of no value? If so, the man who struck the most fatal blow at the prestige of royalty was John Hampden—we mean at that sort of glamor which, notwithstanding the conflicts between Charles and his parliaments, made his person sacred almost to the last. Not till the madmen of the Old Testament covenants and sacraments against backsliding Kings and their idolatrous wives became ascendant in the army was there a thought that threatened the life of Charles. The Cavaliers looked upon Hampden's action for years after his death as the line of conduct most disastrous to the monarchy, and yet not one of them during the entire time spoke of him otherwise than in terms of the highest respect. From the day Cromwell first outraged common decency in the House of Commons in a violent rambling invective until the day he slew the King, then all through the usurpation and until his seat went to that son of his whom Macaulay calls a foolish Ishboseth, he was the subject of contemptuous lampoons, the object of nicknames and the scorn and contempt of honorable men. They thought, rightly or wrongly, at the Restoration that the only way some atonement could be made to justice outraged, loyalty made a crime, antiquity dishonored and King, Church and State trampled under the feet of lawlessness and irreligion was by gibbeting the remains of the principal delinquent. It was an indescribably weak and contemptible act, but it helps our judgment that this Carlylean demi-god was after all only a badly moulded image of brass with feet of clay.

We shall proceed now, as far as our limits will permit, to correct the historical distortion by which Carlyle makes State papers, contemporary documents of all kinds, the consensus of opinion to his own time an elaborate lie and his imagination the source of truth. Certain French publicists in what they regarded as the reactionary day of Charles X. began to discover in the great English Rebellion, of which the presiding genius was Cromwell, that movement of constitutional aspirations and needs in which their own Revolution was conceived. But not until Carlyle said the word did the historical or political philosophy of Britain regard him as one of the lights of progress. To examine his claim to the title of a benefactor of his kind a slight glance at his early history may be of advantage. He was when a young man reckless, violent and dissipated. It is unnecessary to repeat the things told of him on the Cavalier side. He became a bankrupt in business, and then turned to religion, assuming the severest pharasaism of the Puritans. He entered Parliament, and in one or two speeches justified the hopes of his constitu-

ents that no law, no respect for usage, no regard for the religion of the State would restrain him in the expression of their sentiments. Certainly some very strange persons were sent to the Long Parliament in that swing of the political pendulum which carried hot-headed and unreasoning men to the extreme from the monarchical principle. Events came to a crisis; the prospect of civil war was close at hand.

Charles directed that the Irish would recall some regiments that had been disbanded, enroll new regiments, reform their own Parliament and provide for the redress of the grievances concerning which they had been for a long time in treaty with him and for which they had paid him an enormous sum of money. This is the true statement of the origin of what Mr. Morley describes as "the savage aboriginal frenzy of the Irish." The movement was to be kept a secret, but one whose name has had hard measure in the unfair histories of the time became acquainted with it. This is Sir Phelim O'Neil. He was a member of the bar and of Parliament, a man of large estate and had been educated, if we mistake not, a Protestant by the Court of Wards. Some of his followers heard of the King's designs, communicated them, and all who received the intelligence felt that they were likely to serve their own, their master's interests and the King's. They rose up to recover possession of their lands, and it is plain as anything can be that the settlers fled for the most part, and none were slain unless those who offered resistance.³ The government of the Lord Justices was in a panic in proportion to the terrible cruelties it had been exercising all over the country and even in the districts around Dublin. Though these officials had been appointed on the King's behalf as representing his viceroy, they were employing his troops in the service of the Parliament, torturing loyal gentlemen in the chamber of the Castle and murdering or otherwise harassing their tenants. In point of fact, it was at this time from the Council Chamber the secret leaked out that the Catholic religion was to be suppressed and the Catholic proprietors transported to the North American settlements; and this was to be done irrespective of descent. The knowledge of the design more than anything else forced the Catholics of the Pale into an alliance with their co-religionists. If they had no such fear we are very clearly of opinion they would be as ready to hunt down the old Irish and their clansmen as were their fathers or grandfathers under Carew and Mountjoy in the reign of Elizabeth. Recovering from the panic the Lord Justices directed measures of appalling vengeance against the insurgents. For these, as was only natural, there were deeds of

³ The case of Lord Caulfield is the strong one against O'Neil. Caulfield was shot without his knowledge. If O'Neil were guilty, why was he offered pardon by the Parliament in 1649?

a like character committed in retaliation. The outbreak was put down. Not for three years after was there an attempt to make a charge of general massacre. There was nothing of the kind hinted in the reports of the Irish government to the Parliament, but about the year 1644 Temple compiled for purposes of State the invention that three hundred thousand Protestants were massacred in cold blood "or otherwise" during the insurrection in Ulster.

We fully recognize the sharp line of distinction between the action of the Confederate Catholics and the abortive outbreak in Ulster. That the insurgents engaged in that enterprise were disavowed by the virtual Parliament of the Kingdom of Ireland, we mean the Confederation, proves nothing more than the severe and jealous judgment of men of high rank on the proceedings of peasants under dispossessed and factious leaders acting without authority. The use made of the outbreak in England, the declared purpose of the King that he would go to Ireland to put it down,⁴ clearly proved to the Confederates that their policy should be one guided by prudence, resting on sound principles, in accordance with public usages and in support of the institutions of the kingdom. That Sir Phelim O'Neil was not believed to be the sanguinary ruffian the Parliament authorities depict him is clear from the fact that he was one of the Commons in the Confederation, and a little after he was married to a daughter of General Preston, who possessed his own share of the Norman's pride.

The war which the Confederation began early in 1642 was carried on with varying fortune and under unfortunately divided counsels until the death of the King forced Ormond to see what he ought to have seen at first, that these men had other interests in the struggle as well as the reëstablishment of the royal authority. Owing to Ormond's intrigues and his influence with the section of the Confederates belonging to the Pale, Preston spent his time moving about Leinster, Castlehaven levying contributions and fox hunting here and there through two provinces, Clanrickarde for the King practically helping the Parliamentary generals in Connaught, Murrough of the Burnings sometimes striking effectual blows for the Parliament all through Munster and in the adjoining parts of the other provinces, while Monroe with a large army of veteran Scotch was living on the people of Ulster until his power was broken at Benburb by Owen Roe O'Neil. For this playing at cross purposes Ormond is responsible; and Mr. Morley, as well as Irish Catholics of literary mark and historical acumen, are clearly and distinctly wrong in

⁴ It was proved by the Marquis of Antrim that he and others were commissioned by the King to effect the diversion we mentioned, but it was foiled by the leaking out of the secret.

attributing to him statesmanship much higher than the routine experience of Dublin Castle.

However, the period is clear enough to our view and the men who adorned and darkened it. Certainly Cromwell does not come out of a mystery, out of the twilight of history, however skilfully Carlyle weaves his cloud and casts his shadows. In the turmoil of civil war the crazy member of Parliament,⁵ the bankrupt brewer or butcher of Huntingdon or both might find himself at the top. In the turning of the world upside down he would be like the lawless raiders of the Border, who were best served, to use their expression, when the underside was uppermost. It is in vain Carlyle tells us, or in vain Mr. Morley seems to agree with him, that no one can understand the political and social circumstances and interests from 1642 to the landing of Cromwell. They are unhappily plain enough and have their counterparts in the story of the unhappy land. Ever and ever, even at this writing, in a small way, we find the jealous, the ambitious, the covetous endeavoring to defeat the work of reconciliation. There have been men so saddened from age to age that they bowed their heads in despair, smitten by a sense that a hand was against them so strong and pitiless that genius became powerless, devotion an idle sacrifice.

In estimating the year 1649 we do not need the "liquid lightning" in which Carlyle clothes Cromwell to comprehend it. His talk is declamation through a tragic mask, helping the reverberating hollow monotone to the "vague heads" he addresses. There is no sense in the rotund rhapsodical period by means of which he stuns us with "words," "blot," cloud "without a feature" as descriptive terms of the condition of the country when Cromwell for a brief terrible moment rends the veil and shows the heaving billows. The whole is a map easily examined in the authorities of the time; and for the hallucination that has fallen like a spell on so much of the intellect of the United Kingdom and America, Carlyle is the arch-image accountable.

There is something attractive in a theory, even though untenable, under which we are invited to look at an historic personage in a new aspect. We do not think a more financially successful book could appear than one aiming with ability and art at the reversal of the verdict of history. Indubitably circumstances favored the solemn, tragic and quasi-mythical treatment employed by Carlyle. Cromwell, without undue exaggeration, could be puffed up into a Hebrew judge commissioned like Josue to conquer the land flowing with milk and honey promised for an inheritance. There would be a

⁵ He was regarded by the Court party and the bulk of the opposition as a vulgar, irresponsible fanatic, without the power of speaking coherently.

rough force about such a parallelism to which the Biblical turn of your common Englishman and your middle class Englishman would go forth. This investiture, familiar as the Sunday clothes in the meeting house, would make him a tutelary power in the Nonconformist household, by which political and religious problems would find a more apt solution, a more worldly or wide-awake one than the remote dreaminess which carries the Scotchman past the remnant on the hillside, past the first Reformers, past Apostles, past all to the Theocracy. Incidentally we have but the radical difference between the English and Scotch sectary, and we only hope that the Liberals of Scotland will never entertain the idea that the man whose hand was so heavy on their country could have been a friend of liberty any more than the first Edward, who brought them "chains and slavery."

But a Biblical hero was too closely human, too much within the measure of mankind, despite his inspirations and enthusiasms; so we must take a flight to the desert with Carlyle, a hegira, for a new creed; and then to the thunderous mountain walkers of the North, gods of the ice floe and the regions of the mist. To such a conception Cromwell bears as much resemblance as the King in a play does to a real potentate prescinding from the sentiments which in the player King are often very genuine. Or, better still, he is as like the compound of prophet-sheik, Hebrew Judge and heathen world-crusher as any strong-willed, huge-nosed Anglo-Saxon of to-day might be to Osiris blended with Apollo. We must come down from the fantastic world in which Carlyle has placed Cromwell to say that nearly two centuries of political and social degradation loaded the English laborer with a weight unmatched in France from the time La Bruyere gave his picture of the peasant until the latter echoed the cry of barricades bursting from ensanguined towns; and this burden the English laborer owed to Cromwell and the Commonwealth.

The reaction from their tyranny is to be measured by the frenzy of delight with which the people hailed the Restoration. They went into the opposite extreme of surrendering every right of freemen to the Crown, the landed interest and the Church. The enslavement of the laborer, the extinction of the small proprietor and the yeoman followed. Englishmen, with a curious inconsistency and injustice, were determined to efface all the marks of Cromwell's despotism in England and to maintain in their integrity all its marks in Ireland.

The ghastly, immoral and bewildering theories of Carlyle are presented in the language of a morbid conceit qualified by art. They antedate the facts which are to verify them and are in harmony with the facts when these are submitted to refinement in the alchemy of

his mind. That Cromwell, like Frederick, should be the man of his time, he is fashioned, as we have seen, into one clothed with a divine mission. Ambition, hypocrisy and cruelty are transformed into public spirit, prudence and sagacity.

A hundred Irish women are butchered after the battle of Naseby. Mr. Carlyle tells us: "There were taken here a good few 'ladies of quality in carriages' and above a hundred Irish ladies not of quality, tattery camp followers with long skean knives about a foot in length, upon whom I fear the ordinance against Papists pressed hard this day." It will scarcely be believed that there is no authority for the statement that these poor creatures had knives. The whole passage with regard to the Irish women is unfair and the excuse suggested for the butchery is untrue. In the first place there were Irish ladies of quality, wives of officers, among those slain; the others were the wives of the private soldiers. Schomberg, forty years later, speaking of the custom of the Irish soldiers in taking their wives and infants with them, remarked it had in it more of love than policy, a different conception from Carlyle's.

The ordinance referred to was a decree of the Parliament commanding the murder of Irish Papists taken in arms anywhere in England. A similar enactment was made by the Scotch and faithfully executed; in fact, there was an agreement to that effect between the Scotch and their English allies, but the effect of the ordinance was sadly blunted when Prince Rupert began to shoot Parliamentary prisoners for every Irishman killed in cold blood. So much for the divine character of the ordinance against Irish Papists. Now, at the end of two centuries and a half, we must confess that among the many errors of the Confederate Catholics not the least impolitic was their allowing the rules of civilized war to foes who spared neither the prisoner taken in battle nor the peaceful inhabitants of the country. The terrible game of reprisal could alone appeal to men who set no measure to their ferocity except the sense of their own safety.

The Confederates had overwhelming proofs that the extirpation of their religion was the aim of the English Parliament and its officers in Ireland. It is idle for Carlyle to deny that a policy of extermination had been determined on, or suggest it as an invention of Clarendon's, the man least likely of any in England to trouble himself with the making of a fiction which might be injurious to the Cromwellian Settlement in Ireland, which he regarded with the fullest approval and to maintain which he employed his influence and counsel as the first Minister of Charles II. It is impossible to understand Carlyle's language with regard to Clarendon in this instance. He handles the point of extermination in this way: "There goes

a wild story which owes its first place in history to Clarendon, I think, who is the author of many such: How the Parliament at one time had decided to 'exterminate' all the Irish population; and then finding this would not answer had contented itself with packing them all into the province of Connaught, there to live upon the moor lands; and so had pacified the sister island." One without very much difficulty can trace the operation of Carlyle's mind through this passage, the appearance of caution in "I think," and so forth, the sneer at Clarendon as a person easily imposed on or ready to invent or give currency to all manner of tales damaging to the Commonwealth. But he warms to the work and so the authorship, the creation is fastened on Clarendon by a method which if it be generally imitated will put an end to history. He says: "My Lord had the story all his own way for about a hundred and fifty years, and during that time has set afloat through vague heads (sic) a great many things."

We have no exceptional admiration for Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, but we shall cite one or two passages from Macaulay's "History of England," in which the apologist for the great Rebellion as well as the Revolution of 1688, presents his estimate of Hyde: "He had during the first year of the Long Parliament been honorably distinguished among the Senators who had labored to redress the grievances of the nation. . . . When the great schism took place, when the reforming party and the conservative party appeared marshaled against each other, he with many wise and good men took the conservative side. . . . It must be added that he had a strong sense of moral and religious obligation. . . . But his temper was sour, arrogant and impatient of opposition." We submit this judgment of Hyde's character and disposition would be sufficient to dispose of Carlyle's "I think" mounting up the steps of possibility to certainty; but the policy of extermination was so much and so absolutely one of the commonplaces of the time and the failure of it so conspicuously due to circumstances too strong for the actors that one wonders how it could be questioned. The courage of Carlyle is undeniable.

The fact is that the money obtained for the prosecution of the war in Ireland from the beginning of the troubles with the King was advanced by a number of persons called adventurers, who received in return debentures on the estates to be confiscated. There were several loans of the kind and distinctly recognized classes of adventurers according to priority. To these were added the officers and soldiers, to whom had been given debentures on Irish land for their arrears of pay. Lord Clare, in his most remarkable speech in 1800 in support of the Union, stated that almost the entire soil of the

country then changed hands and was parceled out among the representatives of the "two hundred or more sects" which "then infested England." But we clinch the argument by saying Cromwell was himself one of the deputation from Parliament in 1649 to the Guildhall to ask for an additional loan. In answer to the question in what manner the war was to be carried out, the Chief Baron Wild replied to the city authorities: "It will be by rooting out the Papists from the land and planting it with Protestants." Either Carlyle was culpably ignorant of this or he more culpably suppressed the knowledge of it and rode off on his imaginary combat in the lists with Clarendon. He himself supplies evidence enough that Cromwell went out with a mission of punishment, of revenge which should be ample and monumental. In fact, in his speech to the soldiers at Dublin a few days after landing he said that they were to war upon the Canaanites, and as the people of God warred for the promised land and against idolatry, they were to carry on the war in the country to which they had come.

Cromwell entered on his work in a way that deserved success if there were no God, no moral government of the world. Within two days after he sailed he cast anchor in Dublin Bay. Dublin had been surrendered to the Parliament by Ormond rather than that it should fall into the hands of the Confederates, whom he was now leading against Cromwell. It served as a base for the latter, who set out for Drogheda with a splendidly appointed army of twelve thousand men over and above the forces under the other Parliamentary generals in Ireland, and who might be trusted to watch the Irish armies scattered through the provinces. The fleet of ninety-two vessels sailed along the coast in sight of the army. Its business was to maintain supplies and help in the battering of the seaport towns.

On the 3d of September he was before Drogheda. On the 10th a furious cannonade made two breaches in the south wall, wide and practicable as the King's highways. The steeple of St. Mary's on that side of the town had fallen on the 9th. Eight hundred picked troops mounted one of the breaches as a forlorn hope. After a desperate struggle the forlorn hope was flung back on their lines, leaving its colonel dead in the breach. At the third assault Cromwell, at the head of the entire reserve, hurled himself into the breach and forced his way after hard fighting. As the night fell the whole army, horse and foot, were in the streets, the defenders falling back step by step to the Mill mount, where soon a ring of fire and steel girdled them—fully ten thousand men to one-fifth of the number.

It is hardly desirable to proceed further, the particulars are too horrible, and the substance of the defense and subsequent carnage is presented fairly enough by Mr. Morley. One or two incidents

we shall note, as they illustrate Carlyle's contempt for evidence which does not suit him; but the considerations that are important in view of the line of defense or palliation taken by the worshipers of Cromwell we must not lose sight of. We have already intimated the value we set upon the plea that his mission and the distance of that primitive age from this can oust the standard of modern ethics from jurisdiction. We say in passing, Mr. Morley is hardly fair in introducing what he calls the "contention,"⁶ that the slaughter in Drogheda was no worse than some of the worst acts of those commanders in the Thirty Years' War whose names stand out as by-words of savagery. He admits that such extenuation is dubious. Why, there is no earthly comparison; there is not a common factor between theatrocities in Drogheda and the cruelties inflicted now and then, on one side and the other, during the Thirty Years' War. The acts that stand out as written in crimson letters in that war have been always looked on with horror, and viewed as a warning to Christian men how careful they should be in permitting religion to enter the domain of international policy. But in all these instances the savageries were unpremeditated in a manner—that is to say, they were the result of the brutal passions and utter unrestraint from moral principle which arise during a long continued war. The English army in Spain as late as the nineteenth century went through a carnival fairly diabolical in the sack of Badajos, yet no one would dream of trying the soldiers of the Peninsula in the same court with the God-fearing troops of the Parliament,⁷ carrying out the fixed policy of that body and the express commands of their general. It was in no sense of the word military license; it was an indiscriminate fury against the Irish, surpassing that of the Israelites when they entered the Promised Land. It is a problem difficult enough to understand, but there is so much in the history of English warfare resembling it that we must leave the defenders of English aggression to explain the facts. When a people are to be hunted down preparatory to the acquisition of their territory and the confiscation of their property, libels are flung out broadcast. Humanity and the progress of civilization are the excuse for the violation of human and divine laws. The wars of Elizabeth in Ireland, the piracies of the merchant-adventurers in her reign, the conquest of India, the subjugation of Africans are chapters of the policy which asserted itself in the massacre of Drogheda. Such things are done in obedience to a law higher than the rights of weak peoples. This is the explanation, however it may hurt British pharisaism.

⁶ The exact words are "as is contended." ⁷ There is one wickedness of which the Parliamentary troops must be acquitted.

The commander at Drogheda, an English Cavalier who had served with distinction in the Thirty Years' War, placed himself at the head of three hundred men on a steep mound after the breach was won. This position is described by Cromwell as "very strong and of difficult access." It could have been taken only at the cost of several hundreds of lives. This was the consideration on which Sir John Aston and his band were induced to surrender on promise of quarter. They were immediately put to death—Aston's body most frightfully hacked—"chopped in pieces," as if the one-legged old Cavalier of Edgehill was the special object of their detestation and vengeance.⁸ The subsequent order for the slaughter of the men driven to the northern quarter of the town Cromwell himself palliates as given "in the heat of action." The plea does not hold water. If the Canaanites were to be exterminated, the heat of action was not necessary to justify the divine command. If no Irish were to be spared on account of the Ulster massacre, the heat of action is beside the issue. The truth is that Cromwell did not believe either in the Ulster massacre or the inspiration from on high, but the savage nature of his youth was strong in age. How could he believe in the massacre or the inspiration? He had been in treaty for an alliance with O'Neil, which was broken off on the reappearance of Ormond in Ireland to make that "peace" with the Confederates by which a politic name is given to the union of the purely Royalist and the Catholic interest—a "peace" which his master had desired from the beginning. The steps of the alliance between Cromwell and O'Neil are clear. It is another question how far Cromwell was sincere, but the negotiations had unquestionably reached a definite stage when we find Munroe ordered by the Parliament to supply O'Neil with powder.⁹ Now when we remember that O'Neil represented the extreme Catholic interest—what Mr. Morley calls the ultramontane in a connection which shows he has not realized the truly national character of that interest—we can measure pretty accurately the depth of Cromwell's conviction that he was clothed in thunder to destroy the Irish Amorrhite or Misbirth of Nature, or however else his policy may be described in the shifting language of his admirers commenting on his own rather crimson text.

The reality of the belief of a massacre in 1641 and the justice of punishment for it is equally hollow considered side by side with the negotiations mentioned. There are other grounds to establish the fact that however industriously the tale of such a massacre was circulated, there was no one in authority who believed it. The report

⁸ Strafford had a high opinion of Aston's qualities as a leader; and as the reader will remember, Strafford himself was one of the first victims of the great Rebellion in England, if not the first. ⁹ Murrough of the Burnings intercepted the convoy on the way to O'Neil's camp. Murrough was a Royalist at this time.

had served its purpose by throwing the counsels of the King's supporters, Catholic and Royalist, in Ireland into confusion, and by forcing the King into the appearance at least of hostility to his Irish supporters. If an alliance with O'Neil were to be finally effected, the men who invented the report could disavow it and punish their subordinates for libels dangerous to the public interest.

We can do no better than refer the reader to Mr. Morley's chapter in the June number of the *Century* for some particulars of the sack of Drogheda. Of more importance than the blood-curdling tale is the proof that Carlyle affords, in his account of it, of his inability or unwillingness to abandon a preconceived theory. We have spoken of his insistence in the teeth of evidence that we must hold that the massacred garrison of Drogheda was largely English. Would the reader be surprised to learn that Cromwell gives the list of the regiments defending Drogheda, and they are Irish to a man? The document must have been before Carlyle; it is absurd to suppose a man compiling from the works of the individual whom he is to paint as a more than ordinary hero for the worship of this and future ages could overlook a document in itself interesting and connected with the most severely censured episode of his subject's life. We will not labor this point. The indignation we feel compels us to pass from it; but we see those regiments led by the Norman Irishman of the Pale, by the gentleman of Milesian descent from beyond the Pale; we see the yeoman of Meath or from the meadows of the Upper Liffey fall side by side with the Munster clansman, the clansman from the Celtic parts of Leinster, Sir James Dillon's tenants from Mayo and Roscommon. In the sacrament of blood we witness the single hour of union since the long and desolating war began. We hope from that commingled blood of the two thousand victims on the altar of their country the instinct and the passion of a love may spring that shall yet repair the past.

The "knocking on the head" of the officers who for five days, undaunted by the terrible scenes during the time, defended the two remaining gate towers, is told by Mr. Morley in the graphic words of Cromwell; but there are one or two matters which escape him, and these, in pursuance of our purpose to hold Carlyle up in his genuine colors, we cannot leave aside. The townspeople had taken refuge in St. Peter's Church. The troops enter through window and battered door, each soldier bearing as a buckler an infant on his left arm. Up to the galleries so protected they ascend; having flung the bucklers over the wall, and then goes on the slaying, slaying, matron, maid, old man and youth in one red holocaust.

Carlyle speaks contemptuously of a Captain a Wood, an officer in Ingoldsby's regiment, who was about to take compassion on a

young girl, evidently of high rank and great beauty from the description. We do not quite mean that the philosopher of Chelsea finds fault with Wood's weakness, but the story was not worth telling. This is the idea. We shall take the liberty of giving it, premising that Wood was a brother of the great Oxford scholar, Anthony Wood. The latter mentions that it was frequently narrated to the family and among friends by the captain as an experience of the Irish war. We think it too valuable a side-light on the homogeneity of the Biblical religion of the two hundred sects to whom Popery was an idolatrous abomination to be lost sight of.

In the vaults of St. Peter's the rank and fashion of the town sought concealment. When the church was made a shambles, the soldiers descended to the vaults—pike, sword and gun do their work. Among those who were being slaughtered there was a girl, who falls on her knees to Wood. "She was a most handsome virgin, arrayed in costly and gorgeous apparel." With tears and prayers she begged he would save her life. We resume Wood's account: "And being stricken with a profound pity, he took her under his arm, went with her out of the church, with intention to put her over the works to shift for herself; but a soldier perceiving his intentions," thrust his sword through her. This is Anthony's transcript of Thomas a Wood's experience, of whom Carlyle speaks as though he were on terms of domestic intimacy with him, as Tom a Wood, "an old soldier" whose "account of the storm" is "sufficiently emphatic." The account is the most exact of what happened in Drogheda, and the one we have taken in supplementing Mr. Morley; and for the "hacking to pieces" we should have added "chopping to pieces" the body of the governor.¹⁰ Wood winds up the account by letting us see his brother knew, sound Puritan that he was, how the goods of the Canaanites were as the gold and silver of the Egyptians: "Whereupon Mr. Wood, seeing her gasping, took away her money, jewels, etc., and flung her down over the works." There is one circumstance, the particular manner of the slaying of this ill-fated young lady, which cannot be told. We have read accounts of "the Bulgarian atrocities;" and among the vile and hideous methods in which the Turks evinced their contempt and hatred of the slain we could find not an equivalent indeed for the brutalities of the Puritan soldier—or rather for the insane beastliness of his ferocity, but the approach to some resemblance of its turpitude.

We are glad to find that Mr. Morley rejects the plea of success for

¹⁰ We think Astley fought on the Protestant side in the Thirty Years' War—not like Major Dalgetty, who changed sides as often as Murrough O'Brien in Ireland.

the policy of terror which Carlyle and those who follow him profess to discover in the sack of Drogheda. No doubt it was intended by Cromwell to have that effect. Ormond in saying he surpassed himself, that he surpassed all who preceded him in the annals of ferocity,¹¹ adds it was for the purpose of frightening into submission. But a stout, though badly ordered, resistance was maintained., It was not the rending of the darkness by the thunderbolt of Carlyle or Cæsar's "Thrasonical brag" "I came," etc.; it was a war, but one waged with resources, energy and definite purpose against half-starved, badly equipped forces, led aimlessly by two men, one of whom, Castlehaven, had a system unsuited to the country, and the other, Ormond, had no idea of what a system of war meant.

So frightened was Ormond by the story of Drogheda that he ordered Dundalk and Trim to be evacuated. We have in connection with the departure from these towns an insight into the qualities of the Ulster Scotch—they like to be sure of profit. They left the towns unburned in their hurry to get away; they left the cannon behind them in Trim. Up or down the Scotch surrendered Ulster. It is not our way to allow Carlyle, Froude, Macaulay or Hume to make statements or suggest views that are not warranted. Our meaning is that these and other writers assume that all the forces supposed to be acting for the King in the beginning of this year and up to the arrival of Cromwell were still in his service. They were nothing of the kind, and we have a very significant proof of it in a letter by Cromwell to the Speaker Lenthall. When Cromwell landed in Ireland his force between the troops he brought with him and the men already there fighting for the Parliament amounted to seventeen thousand men. The secession of the Ulster Scotch increased it immensely in material and moral power; and we feel bound to say that at this dark period the character of Ormond stands forth in a fine light, superior to fortune like the Roman who never despaired of the Republic. His want of military knowledge he is not to be blamed for, but even now he would not adopt the strategy most likely to embarrass Cromwell, because of a possibility that the Confederate Catholics might treat with him. He is throughout the evil genius of the Irish cause.

As if not satisfied with the terror inspired by Drogheda, Cromwell decided on attempting Wexford. It must be recollected that the province of Ulster was in the hands of his troops and their allies and the country south of the Boyne to Dublin. His fleet was outside; if he proceeded through Wicklow to Wexford, the fleet could attend him and keep up his supplies the whole way. It was well

¹¹ We wonder had Mr. Morley Ormond's opinion before him when he compared the massacres in Drogheda with acts of savagery on the Continent.

worth his while to go to that town; he had friends there. The Recorder of the town, Hugh Rochfort, formerly "a violent partisan of the Nuncio's,"¹² was in correspondence with Cromwell through Mr. Nicholas Loftus, a man of considerable estate in the county.

Poor little Moore, who had a warm heart of his own, despite vanities and puerilities, passionately prayed

For a tongue to curse the slave
Whose treason like a deadly blight

defeats the policy and efforts of the patriot planning and fighting for all he holds dear. We know there is no in use cursing traitors any more than in bemoaning misfortunes, but in what we write we have a purpose. There are a few objects to be borne in mind which we should like our readers would spell out of this article, not the least of which is the spirituality or idealism, if you like it better, of the Irish race. There is even in this horrible episode of Wexford an instance of high, haughty and fearless rectitude walking the road of honor leading to death with a punctiliousness like knight errantry. What about Carlyle's Old Testament cum Alkoran hero and his "resarted" thunder suit, his profound guile and suspicious watchfulness of the interests of his ambition in England, when compared with the pure motive, the stainless honor which preferred ruin to compromise with suspected or discredited allies? The coarse lineaments of the English middle-class Titan stare in their repulsiveness at us when into the gallery of the mind move Butler and Iveagh¹³ and the staunch Catholic townsmen who required a proof of orthodoxy before accepting aid from those who had once wavered or who even now would seem to be within the meaning of Rinuccini's interdict. We need only say that Cromwell may point to the treason of Strafford as freeing him from the obligations of the treaty with the governor of the town. Mr. Morley discusses, as if it were a question of military casuistry, the right to murder the inhabitants of Drogheda; the question here might be how far Cromwell was bound by his own terms to the governor. We do not think where Cromwell is concerned and his soldiers, where the Parliament, the Commonwealth is concerned, that nice questions can be profitably considered. The Irish in not acting like Prince Rupert, or like the Cromwellians themselves, deserved everything that befel them at the hands of those enemies of human right and intercourse. The upshot of it all is that the Wexford people of all ranks became "a prey to the soldiers;"¹⁴ and so universal was the slaughter of them that Cromwell informs the Speaker that

¹² Carte's "Life of Ormond." ¹³ Maginnis Lord Iveagh, who led some companies of Ulstermen all the way to Wexford through a country in Cromwell's hands. ¹⁴ Cromwell to Speaker.

not one in twenty of the owners could now claim any property in the town.

We do not purpose to notice Carlyle's scoffing at the women murdered at the cross which stood in the middle of the market place. What we shall do is to express regret that an Irish Walter Scott like him who has so finely portrayed the courage and endurance of the Covenanters has not arisen to paint the terrible scene when the women from every part of the town rushed in their despair to the foot of the great stone cross, under the shadow of which they might die in the hope of a happy resurrection, if Christian soldiers would not be moved to pity at sight of the imaged sufferings of the Christ. Such a writer linking the tragedy of the market place to the fortunes of some characters in whom his genius had interested us would describe in plain, unvarnished language—any other would degrade the majesty of truth—the rows kneeling down, becoming rings concentrated within rings as the panic-stricken, panting creatures came and threw themselves down—mother and daughter and sister—in agony of expectation as to what awaited, while the work of murder was going on elsewhere. He would tell how from some place where wretches had been forced into the Slaney and drowned, from where boats of fugitives were sunk, from the ramparts out of which leaped other wretches in panic, or from which others still were forced to leap, the wild-eyed, stern enthusiasts came with military precision, armed as strong men with pike and gun and halberd to do the commanding of the Lord. He would say how a sweet resignation came to the kneeling women when it was their blood only that was required, and that like the martyrs of old a halo was encircling them; or, if any faltered, if human love or weakness cast its shadow over the moment, how the thought passed as Father Raymond Stafford, in his brown habit cinctured by a rope, bareheaded, barefooted, holding the Crucifix on high, stepped into the arena amid the smoke and moans and carnage.

We think we may turn our back on this method of war. Enough has been said to make it incumbent on all who have the slightest interest in the advancement of the Irish race and an honest desire that the claims of the Catholic Church on the English race shall be effectively presented to make a stand against the abuse of the language and the prostitution of the literature to the purpose of maintaining a public lie and of pandering to an insatiable national vanity. Nothing is gained by it. The sense of a pretentious superiority is fed to fatness, the modesty of merit is pushed aside. As we write we hear that the pure sentiment which lent a dignity to Irish literary effort and a self-denial to Irish political life is fading or is being changed into a spirit of cynical enterprise. This is not a desirable prospect.

The policy which imitated the captivities told of in Holy Writ, or the terrible experiments of transplantation when Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian Kings carried off provinces to found settlements in distant regions, failed to darken the spiritual character of the Irish people. It is in danger now from a spurious advancement, a shallow imitation of vulgar materialism. As a protest against this tendency we have spoken these words, told this tale. If we have done it well, we have spoken as we would; if not well, we have spoken as we could.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York.

THE SOURCE OF MORAL OBLIGATIONS.

AMONG the curious phenomena of the revival of classical learning in the fifteenth century may be reckoned the peculiar bitterness with which men of letters conducted their disputes. If a scholar detected his rival in a false quantity he deduced the conclusion that he had likewise violated each of the precepts of the decalogue and was addicted to most of the seven deadly sins. That style of controversy is a thing of the past; and yet when it is not a question of classical learning, but important principles of philosophy that are at stake, the acerbity of the dispute, though veiled, is scarcely less deep-seated than of old. The empiricist suggests that the scholastic philosopher has not altered his point of view since the days of Duns Scotus, and the scholastic hints that empiricists are the enemies of God and man. There is in fact more justification for warmth of feeling where these problems are concerned. They may appear at first sight merely matter for the study and the lecture hall; yet the character of a whole society, a whole nation, is profoundly and rapidly modified according to the doctrine which prevails. What is at first but the teaching of a few professors at the universities is ten years later the common-place of the clubs of the capital, of the daily papers, of the sermons of preachers. Nor do the principles thus adopted remain in the chrysalis condition of speculation. When men have accepted a theory they proceed for good or for evil to reduce it to "crude hard fact" with a logical consistency as relentless as that of a syllogism. Amongst these questions there is perhaps none the current doctrine on which more profoundly influences the national life than that of the authority of conscience. Where men hold that conscience has a right to coerce them their character will in the long run be formed on the principle

that duty is the first and imperative rule. Where the coercive power is explained away the claims of duty will fare but ill. That this is so may afford us sufficient justification for an attempt to answer Shylock's question and say why it is that the dictates of conscience *must* be obeyed.

Our own experience is sufficient to show us that the voice of conscience deals with us authoritatively, that when it speaks to us it claims the prerogatives of a supreme power in our regard. Nor is any profound examination required to assure us that it is no artificial creation, but a constitutive part of human nature wherever that nature is not stunted and deformed; that it cannot, as has sometimes been asserted, be explained by the pressure exerted on us by public opinion. The essential characteristic of the obligation which the law of conscience imposes on us is that it is not simply a necessity occasioned by the advisability of avoiding some disagreeable alternative. It is not a contingent, but an absolute necessity. It does not say to us: "If you do not do this it will be the worse for you," but simply and absolutely: "You ought to do this—by the moral law you *must* do it." Nor can its dictates be reduced to the formula, "Do right, or you will violate your human dignity." Were it so its authority would, we fear, have but an insecure foundation. Many a man would be disposed to say, and not without some justification, that poor human dignity had had so many shocks already that one or two more could make but little difference.

What is the explanation of this obligation? Whence comes this "categoric imperative" which deprives me of my liberty, and which if I disobey it, sets me in the position of a criminal before a judge? There is something which takes right conduct from the sphere of the æsthetically correct and the intellectually true, gives it a new complexion and transforms it into something entirely different, namely, bounden duty. The change is so complete that no sense of exaggeration is aroused when the poet personifies Duty and speaks of her as the "stern daughter of the voice of God." This question as to how we are to account for the change from right to duty has with justice been termed the central question of ethical philosophy.

There is a short and easy way of explaining the mysteries presented to our consideration by Nature and by man, which has found vogue at all times and as it seems is not out of fashion yet. It consists in boldly denying the existence of the fact which we are called on to explain. Thus we have seen the mutual interaction of bodies denied by one school of philosophers, the existence of matter by another, the objectivity of space and time by a third, free will by a fourth, the permanence of individual personality by another, and so on. The explanations of moral obligation given us by philosophers

of the Hedonistic school are open to this objection. When called on to account for the coerciveness of the dictates of conscience they deny that they possess any. We may illustrate this from Mr. J. S. Mill's treatise on Utilitarianism. The internal sanction of duty lies, he tells us, in "a feeling in our own mind, a pain more or less intense attendant on the violation of duty, which in properly cultivated moral natures rises in the more serious cases into shrinking from it as an impossibility." The origin of this feeling he explains as follows: "Society between equals can only exist on the understanding that the interests of all are to be consulted equally. . . . In this way people grow up unable to conceive as possible a state of total disregard of other people's interests. . . . Not only does all strengthening of social ties and all healthy growth of society give to each individual a stronger personal interest in practically consulting the welfare of others; it also leads him to identify his *feelings* more and more with their good, or at least with an ever-growing practical consideration for it." Such an explanation, though not lacking in ingenuity, is surely only one more illustration of the play of "Hamlet" with the part of the Prince of Denmark omitted. Where, we ask, in all this is there any room for *obligation*, for the factor of coerciveness? Pleasure and pain are one thing; bounden duty is another. Those who confuse them are simply throwing dust in our eyes. Yet here we are taught that the stern voice of duty may be reduced to the prudential dictates of an enlightened self-interest which arise in a "properly cultivated moral nature," and that the imperative commands of the moral law grow out of pleasurable and painful feelings. "Why not then," says a modern critic¹ with justifiable impatience, "sunbeams from cucumbers, or the sense of ethical justice from the varieties of the triangle?"

Not only is there no room for obligation in such a theory, but whereas the law of conscience is a law of right, that of Hedonism, if logically interpreted and consistently followed out, is a principle of the purest selfishness; and this is true even if we concede for a moment that the norm of right action is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. For if the *summum bonum* for each individual is his own greatest happiness no reason can be assigned why conscience should bid him seek the greatest happiness, not of himself, but of others. It is needless to point out that it is a mere sophism to say that because every individual seeks his own greatest happiness, therefore each severally is bound to seek the greatest happiness of all. On the contrary, each on that hypothesis would remain consulting his own interests and putting those of others outside his calculations. So far, then, as a counsel which lacks all obligatory

¹Mr. W. S. Lilly: "Right and Wrong," page 88.

force can be termed a law, the law which Hedonism gives us is merely

"The good old rule the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

At the present time, however, it is Mr. Herbert Spencer who, of all the thinkers who place the foundation of morals in utility, exerts the widest influence among English-speaking people. It cannot be said that his writings lie open to the charge of containing this fallacy. He does not tell us that because we each desire our own happiness we are therefore bound to desire something which differs from it so entirely as the greatest happiness of all. The theory of development which holds so large a place in every part of his system supplies him with a convenient solution for the difficulty which is raised by the fact that conscience often bids us act in a way which seems contrary to the principle of expediency. The experience of past time has, he tells us, shown what course of action usually conduces to the welfare of the tribe, and the results of the experience thus accumulated is stored up in our brain tissue, so that we feel disposed to act in a way which would not naturally appear to be the most advantageous in the particular case; to this registered experience is due our innate dislike of lying, stealing and other breaches of the decalogue. We are not concerned here to enquire whether the testimony of facts lends any support to this view, or whether it be mere guesswork, unsupported by adequate evidence. It is sufficient for our purpose that here, too, righteousness, as understood by Mr. Spencer, is merely that which most conduces to the happiness of the tribe, and that, as we have already seen, this leaves the main characteristic of conscience unaccounted for. Moral obligation will not grow out of any number of experiences of the advantageous consequences resulting from an action.

To pass from those writers who base the moral law on considerations of pleasure and pain, and to turn to the theory of Kant is like emerging from the heavy vapors of a marsh into a purer air. That great thinker recognized the authoritative character of the voice of conscience, and made no effort to explain it away. He allowed that it could never be accounted for on any Hedonistic theory, and turned to find its origin in the rational nature of man. Further than this, as it seemed to him, we need not go, for the tendency to prescribe this law is essential to our rational nature. We find the law within us. The categorical imperative of the practical reason which is native to us and is not received as an imposed command from an external source belongs to our dignity as men. In virtue of our free-will, of our power of determining our own conduct, we are capable of obey-

ing these commands or disobeying them, of consulting our human dignity or of treading it underfoot. Hence he taught that morality consists in obedience to these dictates of reason, and that only when we act in accordance with this law, and purely because such is the law, is our action moral.

Yet of the philosophy of Kant no less than of that of the Hedonists we can only say that the obligation it provides us with is a figment. He tells us that we are obliged to obey the commands of reason. But no man can in any true sense impose commands on himself or lie under an obligation to his own higher faculties. We can, in fact, only employ these terms in virtue of a metaphor in which we represent man as divided into two parts, and endow each with some shadow of personality. All the support which the Kantian theory can lend to the law of conscience is to say that if we do not obey it we shall cease to be living as men, and shall become degraded and corrupt. But the individual may answer that after all he is not bound to live the life of an ideal man, and that he entirely declines to be forced to do so against his will. Nor can we make any reply demonstrating that he is under any necessity to do so. This philosophy can, in fact, only give to the moral law a contingent necessity which, as we have seen, differs completely from the absolute necessity that belongs to the dictates of conscience. An absolute necessity admits of no alternative. All material beings save man are guided to their end by the necessity of physical law. Man is guided not by physical law, but by the moral law as revealed in conscience; and since the execution of the moral law is dependent on a free agent we often think of it as possessed of a less absolute necessity than belongs to physical law. We should remember that the moral law never consents to our adopting the alternative of disobedience, whatever be the consequences of obedience to ourselves or others. *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum!* The necessity of the moral law is absolute, only it rules not in the physical, but the moral order. In contrast to this the moral law as set forth by Kant can claim no higher degree of coerciveness than is possessed by a contingent obligation. We must obey it *if* we desire to live as men, *if* we would avoid handing ourselves over as slaves to the cravings of our lower nature. But in all this there is no vestige of real authority, of that categorical imperative which, as he truly tells us, is manifested in the dictates of our practical reason.

The problem, then, which we are called on to solve is to explain how this absolute necessity can arise. And the imposition of an absolute moral necessity as distinguished from one that is purely contingent is not so unknown a circumstance in our ordinary experience that it should be hard for us to find examples and hence to ar-

rive at some conclusions as to the nature of conscience. Let us, for instance, take the case of a child who has been told by his father not to touch some china that lies within his reach. No one, we may presume, will call this a merely contingent necessity and say that all that the command amounts to is that the child must either obey or take the punishment which follows disobedience. On the contrary, all liberty of choice is taken from him. He is under an absolute moral obligation of doing what he has been told, and if he neglects to do so he will have grievously offended against the moral law of childhood. For by virtue of his nature as a child he is totally dependent on his father, the protector and guide, without whose care he would perish. As yet he depends for his existence on the family of which he is a member, and hence he is subject to the head of that family, and may not act contrary to his expressed command. Being in this very real sense one with his parent, he has no more right to disobey him than a member of the body has to disobey the will. If *per impossibile* we suppose the hand to be endowed with sufficient liberty of choice to be able at its own discretion to obey the will or not, it would still be bound to obey it, since it is a part of the same being, and a part which by its very nature is subordinate and dependent. In an analogous way the child is dependent on and bound to obey his father. If he does not do so, he may suffer punishment and so have erred against the Hedonistic code, or he may escape scot free; but most assuredly he is morally blameworthy.

The conclusion to be drawn will now be clear. It is that a moral obligation is found wherever a will to which we are rightfully subject imposes a certain choice on us as a duty. When this is the case our free-will can be bound in the moral order as truly as the processes of growth in a plant are bound and determined in the physical order. Moreover, this relation of dependence on the will of another is very frequent. The members of a corporate body owe this obedience to their head wherever the body is no purely artificial creation, but one whose members are linked together by the operation of the natural law.

All the various forms of dependence which we find thus obtaining between one man and another are only partial. Their sphere may be a wide one, or may be very circumscribed; but in each case there are definite limits which we can assign. There is, however, one relation of dependence which is absolutely unrestricted and of which all these are but reflections. This is the complete dependence by which man is bound to his Creator. Not only do we owe our existence to God, but without His active conservation we should fall back into the nothingness out of which He drew us. He has created us to obey His law, and to that end has put the fundamental principles

of the natural law within the knowledge of every rational being. The authority of a father over his son, of a King over his subjects, of a master over his servants are but faint reflections of this primal fountain of authority, the sovereignty of God. Here, then, is the source of moral obligation—in the will of God.

It may, however, be urged, and not without some show of justification, that if obligation is constituted by the expressed will of God, this should be clearly recognizable in the voice of conscience. Yet it is evident that in the greater number of occasions when we act in obedience to duty, we do so without express advertence to a Divine command. But an authority which does not manifest itself in the individual cases of obligation cannot constitute the obligation. Whatever the constituting factor may be we should be able to recognize it in every call of duty.

To this we would reply that though we may not explicitly advert to the fact that the command proceeds from God, yet we cannot but be conscious, and that, too, in each individual case, that the law of duty commands our obedience as something superior to us which is our rightful master and whose claim may not be denied. But a law which is invested with such a supremacy as this, and which can thus demand the obedience of free agents must proceed from a personal lawgiver, and that lawgiver can be no other than our Creator. In other words, it is patent on reflection to all who have the use of reason that to obey conscience is to obey not a mere abstraction—an impersonal rule of conduct—but a personal God. If this conclusion be rejected, it seems scarcely possible to conceive of any other hypothesis on which the facts before us could be adequately explained.

In thus deriving duty from the command of God we do not intend to suggest that the moral law is made known to us in some supernatural way; that conscience is, as it were, something extrinsic—a pressure of the Divine will upon ours, not necessarily belonging to man in his natural state. Such a view would rightly be held to imply that human nature was created imperfect and only able to attain its final end by a special intervention of the Creator. It will be seen on consideration that a creature endowed like man with intelligence and free-will must in the natural order of things be subject to such a law, and be conscious that it is the design of the Creator that he should obey it. The light of reason suffices to show man what actions befit a being such as he is. By its aid he knows that if he is to attain to the highest state of which his human nature is capable the lower appetites must be held in subjection, that they must be checked and controlled by the will; that his faculties must not be allowed to become inert through idleness, but must be de-

veloped and cultivated ; that as a man amongst other he must be true and just in his dealings ; that as a son he stands in a certain relation to his parents, as a citizen to his country, as a father to his children, and that to each of these relations correspond certain actions which befit him. He knows, in fact, the natural law. But he realizes further that he is a creature owing implicit obedience to the will of his Creator, and this shows him that the natural law is imposed on him as a duty. For it would be repugnant to common sense to suppose that the Creator of such a race of beings does not actively desire that their life should be such as befits their nature ; to suppose, either, that He is indifferent to their actions, or that He wishes them to be in violation of the nature He has given. True, He has made man's will free. But this cannot obscure the fact that it must be His desire that man should obey those dictates of the natural law which reason makes clear to him ; that they come to him as commands and not merely as a course which he may adopt or not as he pleases. There is, then, no need to suppose the existence of some extrinsic monition in order to account for conscience. It is simply reason recognizing the moral law as obligatory on us, and speaking to us of our responsibility in its regard.

From what has been said it is plain in what consists the true malice of the violation of the law of duty. It does not lie in any diminution of the happiness of the greatest number, nor in the retribution which may await the wrongdoer in a future life, nor yet in the confusion and disorder which he introduces into the designs of Providence, but purely in his disobedience. When a child disobeys his parent, or a subordinate defies the orders of a legitimate superior, the two personalities are brought into direct antagonism. Where there was harmony and concord, there is now aversion, and this aversion continues as long as the will of the subject remains in rebellion. The case is similar between God and man ; by disobedience to the voice of conscience man averts himself from God, and this alone, apart from all consideration of punishment, renders his act essentially evil.

The distinction between obligation as we have explained it and the sanctions of the moral law should be clearly borne in mind. This is all the more needful since some philosophers appear to hold that the sanctions of the law constitute its obligation. The sanctions of a law are the reward and punishment which follow on our obedience and disobedience to it, respectively. Obligation, as we have seen, is a necessity in the moral order by which a free agent is bound to obey the law ; it has nothing to do with the consequences of the action. Those, therefore, who tell us that our every act is caused by a consideration of its results are endeavoring to persuade us that it

is invariably the sanctions and not the obligations which form the motives of our action. It is, of course, sufficiently evident that even in this life sanctions are attached to the observance and non-observance of the moral law. These sanctions are, it must be owned, imperfect; and long ago the apparent success which sometimes attends those who set that law at defiance led to the complaint that the wicked "come in no misfortune like other folk." Yet on the whole and in the long run honesty is the best policy, even here. But what we do deny most emphatically is that we must needs act from policy, that there is no such thing as acting purely because we ought, and that the very idea of such action is a mere chimera.

Is there not, however, a sense in which it may be said that our doctrine of obligation only provides us with a new sanction as our motive—a sanction of a more refined kind than pleasure or pain, but nevertheless a mere sanction; and that we have thus only established more firmly the doctrine that there is no obligation which does not spring from this source. It may be said that it is admitted on all hands that no man can act unless with a motive. Some end-in-view there must needs be in every action. Now this end-in-view must be some good to be obtained by the agent; it is not necessary that it should be any mere pleasure; it may consist in the continuance of the due relation between the agent and the Author of the moral law; but some individual good there must be. Analyze, it will be urged, any act said to be done purely from obligation, and you will find that even on your own hypothesis it comes to this: "I obey the law because if I do so I shall be at peace with God, while if I do wrong there will be antagonism between His will and mine. What is this after all but a sanction—an old friend with a new face? You are at bottom acting to obtain a personal reward, nor would it be possible to find any act which in its final resolution is not self-regarding."

Here we have the last word of those who would see selfishness at the root of all human action. It is, so to speak, their last line of defense; but though specious it is not really tenable. For the ultimate end-in-view which man in virtue of his nature tends to aim at is not, as is here suggested, self-advantage. He may, of course, deprave his nature and become entirely self-centred, but in so far as he does so his character is deteriorated and distorted. For in man there is an innate tendency to seek the interests of good for its own sake, and apart from all reference to self. Just as a patriot may forego his own private ends and labor solely for the good of his country, so man tends to forget the advantages which accrue to him from well-doing, and to do right for right's sake. There is a true sense in which each individual is not an independent unit, but a part

Vol. XXVI—Sig. 4.

of a greater whole; for men are not made for solitary, but for social life. And the well-established principle that the parts of an organism tend primarily to promote the good of the whole, and only secondarily to their own good, is no less true of men as members of a body corporate than of the parts of a material body. But man is not only a part of a whole as regards his country, but also as regards the *civitas Dei*. As a created being possessed of the faculty of reason he recognizes himself as a constituent part of that great polity whose head is God and whose other members are his fellow-men, who, like him, are children of God. Hence just as it is natural to a citizen to put his country's interests before his own, so it is natural for man to see in the victory of good over evil—in other words, in the success of God's cause—the great end-in-view of life.

The theory which would make selfishness our motive is further objectionable because it practically denies that actions can have any inherent goodness capable of becoming a motive to our will except such as is derived from their utility to the agent. It tells us that when we imagine we are acting from a sense of obligation we are not obeying the law because obedience itself is intrinsically good, but because it is useful to us. Hence it makes the only true good a subjective state to be attained by the individual. All else it deprives of substantial goodness, only allowing to it such excellence as may belong to it as a means to this. It is, of course, plain that there are many acts which only have a value derived from the result they effect; as, for example, study, which may be pursued for the most worthy or for the most unworthy ends. But there are many actions which are in themselves substantially good; we may instance the internal acts of patience, charity, forgiveness of injuries, divine worship and the like. Anything which is substantially good, of whatever kind its goodness be, is capable of attracting the will and acting on it as a motive, altogether apart from any result to which it may contribute. Were it not so, indeed, the perception of a beautiful scene could never move our will to acts of admiration and love unless it were such as to confer on us some personal advantage. Among acts which thus possess a goodness of their own we may reckon the act of obedience to legitimate authority. It is plain, then, that the moral excellence of acting from a sense of obligation may be a genuine motive, and that we may perform such an act without any reference to our self-interest.

Yet, although it is possible for us to do our duty from no other motive than the cause of right and the service of God, experience tells us that in a vast number of cases it is the reward and the punishment which influence us. To children and to those who are deaf to the voice of virtue as long as her hands are empty, it is the only

method of appeal. Indeed, there is no one who does not on many occasions require the props which sanctions afford. The saints, both by example and precept, recommend us to meditate on heaven and hell, and warn us that our perseverance in the way of justice will be very brief unless we do so. Nor is there anything to cause surprise in the fact that much of our right action flows from this source. The task before us is to obey a law which irks and galls our lower inclinations. We are bidden follow the dictates of reason and keep a firm grip on the "demos" of our passions, which are always seething in suppressed revolt. Towards this end we are provided with two great helps. We are able to form habits of self-government which become a second nature to us and tide us over those points where either reason or will is not on the alert; and we are further able to keep our minds fixed on the certain truth that obedience will eventually be rewarded and disobedience sternly punished. Unprovided with these aids our own consciences will tell us how incompetent we should be to support the strain involved in being faithful to the voice of duty.

A moment's consideration will show us how entirely the legitimate self-regard of which we are here speaking—that "calm and reasonable self-love" on which so much stress is laid by Butler in his "Analogy of Religion"—differs from selfishness. An action is positively selfish when we seek some private good, consciously setting aside all consideration as to whether it is right or not, when even though conscience forbid it we determine to pursue our end. Here we explicitly yield to our lower tendencies. There is no resemblance between this and the case where we obey conscience and follow the higher impulses of our nature, but are led to do so by the sanctions attached to the observance of the law. We are not here speaking of the action of a man who is honest simply through fear of the police-constable. In that case it is the external act alone which conforms to the law of right; as far as desire can carry him the man is simply dishonest. We are supposing a case where the man is genuinely honest, not only externally, but internally, but where it is the consideration of heaven and hell that has made him so. It is an absurdity to call this positive selfishness. We have seen that to constitute a positively selfish action a man must determine to pursue his end irrespective of the law of conscience. But no man can say without absurdity: "I am determined to escape hell, and shall continue trying to do so, even if conscience and the law of God forbid me." All that can be said of actions thus motived is that though not positively unselfish, they are self-regarding in such a way as not to interfere with our duty to God, but to aid it. Thus they are legitimate, and even laudable; for when our sense of the inherent goodness and at-

tractiveness of the service of God becomes dulled it is right that we should pursue the blessings which that service brings with it.

We have doubtless against us here the Kantian theory, which will allow the title of moral to no action unless it is not only in accordance with the moral law, but is also done purely for the sake of that law. A right action done for the sake of obedience is, according to this school, simply non-moral. Their point of view is tersely summed up by von Hartmann when he says that it is as absurd to hope to become moral by means of laws prescribed by the reason of another and not our own, as it would be to hope to become fat on meals taken by another person. The root of this doctrine is to be found in their view of man as entirely independent; they do not consider him as a being who by his very nature is dependent on and subject to God. Hence, as we have already explained, they have no satisfactory account to give of obligation which necessarily involves a law-giver. They are driven to find the lawgiver and the subject in the same person, failing to see that only by a metaphor can a man be said to owe a duty to his higher self. And, further, having lost the clue to the true character of moral action, they have substituted a definition which while it is insufficient on the side of obligation is too strict in regard to the motives which it requires. Their theory, taking no account of the author of the moral law, does not allow them to recognize the provision by which He has assigned sanctions to its observance in order that we may be assisted to neglect the solicitations of our lower nature, and act from motives which though not the highest are nevertheless legitimate. All such actions are placed by them on the same level with those done at the instance of the lower appetites. Such an estimate is evidently erroneous; for if we recognize the call as that of duty, our obedience to it cannot lose its character as a moral act because we are moved to obey by the knowledge that our obedience will be recompensed.

The question to which we have here attempted to provide a satisfactory answer is no matter of merely speculative interest with which the student alone is concerned. We have already called the attention of our readers to the momentous issues with which men's beliefs on this matter are fraught. Who shall estimate the number of those who consciously or unconsciously have taken the doctrines of Mill and Spencer as the principles by which they regulate their lives? Whither such doctrines must infallibly lead we have endeavored to indicate; and the testimony of facts may be invoked to show that what we have said is no more than the truth. Where these views have become popular society is to a large extent frankly pagan, the race for wealth or pleasure absorbs all energies and the authority of conscience is openly denied. It is a prospect well calculated to fill us with apprehension for the future. We all know how clear is the

witness of history that the decay of moral principle is the near harbinger of social disruption and national degradation. With the rejection of the authority of conscience is inseparably united the neglect of private duties and a contempt for all obligations towards the nation and its rulers. We are apt to smile at the exaggerated deference paid in old days by subjects to the governing power; perhaps we blame it as servile and inconsistent with the dignity of the individual. A more careful reflection would lead us to recognize that the almost contemptuous disregard which has taken its place is a symptom of far graver import than that extravagant obedience. A firm belief in the authority of conscience, if it could be restored, would be the true cure for these evils. That would not be one of those nostrums on which, under the name of "Morrison's pills," Carlyle has heaped such merited ridicule; but a medicine which would heal society in the only way in which it can be healed, by altering the character of the individuals of whom it is composed.

G. H. JOYCE, S. J.

St. Asaph, North Wales.

THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVISM.

"Labor is the source of all wealth and all culture. and as useful work in general is possible only through society, so to society—that is to all its members—belongs the entire product of labor by an equal right, to each one according to his reasonable wants—all being bound to work.

"In the existing society the instruments of labor are a monopoly of the capitalist class; the subjection of the working class thus arising is the cause of misery and servitude in every form.

"The emancipation of the working class demands the transformation of the instruments of labor into the common property of society and the coöperative control of the total labor, with application of the product of labor to the common good, and just distribution of the same." (*Opening words of the programme of the united socialistic bodies of Germany, laid down in the congress of Gotha, May, 1875—where the collective principle assumed political importance in the formation of the "Socialistic workingmen's party of Germany."*)

"The economic development of civil society necessarily leads to the destruction of small industries, the basis of which is private ownership of the laborer in the means of production. It divests the laborer of all means of production and transforms him into a penniless proletarian, while the means of production become the sole property of a comparatively small number of capitalists and real estate owners.

"Private property in the means of production, which formerly was a means of securing to the producer the ownership of his produce, has nowadays become a means of dispossessing farmers, laborers and small merchants, and of making the non-laborers—capitalists and landlords—the possessors of the produce of labor. Only the transformation of private capitalistic property in the means of production—i. e., land, mines and mining, raw material, tools, machinery and means of communication—into common property, and the change of private production into socialistic—i. e., production for and through society—can effect that the extensive industry and the ever-increasing productiveness of social labor shall become for the downtrodden classes, instead of a fountain of misery and oppression, a source of the highest prosperity and of universal and harmonious perfection.

"The struggle of labor against capitalistic oppression is necessarily a political one. The laboring class cannot carry on its industrial struggles and develop its economic organization without political rights. It cannot effect the transfer of the means of production into the possession of the body social without possessing

itself of political power." (*Extracts from the platform of the socialistic working-men's party, as adopted at Erfurt in October, 1891.*)

"With the founders of this republic we hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be owned and controlled by the whole people; but in the light of our industrial development we hold, furthermore, that the true theory of economics is that the machinery of production must likewise belong to the people in common.

"Resolved, That we call upon the people to organize with a view to the substitution of the coöperative commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder. . . . We call upon them to unite with us in a mighty effort to gain by all practicable means the political power." (*Extracts from the Socialistic Labor Party platform, adopted at Chicago, October 12, 1889.*)

"Against such a system (the present despotic system of economics) the Socialist Labor Party once more enters its protest. Once more it reiterates its fundamental declaration that private property in the natural sources of production and in the instruments of labor is the obvious cause of all economic servitude and political dependence.

"We, therefore, call upon the wage workers of the United States and upon all other honest citizens to organize under the banner of the Socialistic Labor Party into a class-conscious body, aware of its rights and determined to conquer them by taking possession of the public powers." (*Extracts from the platform of the Socialist Labor Party, adopted at New York, July 9, 1896.*)

"To unite all persons who are in favor of the coöperative commonwealth as a substitute for the present competitive system." (*Expression of the aim of the Social Democracy of America, at special convention held in Chicago, June, 1897.*)

THE economic question of the hour is the question of paternal government under that form of socialism which is now coming to be denominated Collectivism. This collectivism is something with which every one who by his single vote has a voice in the nation's councils should make himself acquainted. Unfortunately, its fundamental principle is often enough not thoroughly comprehended not only by antagonists, but even by promoters. The socialism which we are asked to understand is not that which was identified with the Reign of Terror or the Commune. It is not the old-time communism or anarchy. It is an economic theory of state polity which has taken its place in the recognized politics of civilized nations, with a seat in imperial parliaments and a regular ticket in municipal elections. It is not a political economy, but an economic polity.

What is this new socialism, this collectivism? Its fundamental principle, with which alone we propose to deal, and which was announced by Karl Marx more than thirty years ago as the one necessary condition for the true economic social reconstruction, is the *abolition of private capital*. By capital we are to understand capital in the active sense, capital that is applied to production. Idle capital which is not applied in any way to bring a return, and which can be used only to be diminished, is not classed as capital to-day. The final object of all collectivism is to do away with private capital as applied to every industry, thus to do away with competition; and to substitute for competition a collective ownership of all the means and instruments of production. Whatsoever is to be employed in

production is to be put under official control as a collective capital and is to be common property. Results are to be distributed simply according to the contribution of individual labor which each one makes to the common welfare whilst employing the common instruments upon the common material.

In this collectivism there can be no private enterprise to yield a return in interest, profit or dividend. That is to say, there can be no competition. Hence there can be no private profit, no private agreement upon wages. Employment can be given only by the one absolute monopolist, the entire community. Wages can be only a certificate of the labor that has been contributed. This certificate is to be redeemable in the results of the common production.

Howsoever much we may have hitherto despised this theory, it is time for us to see that it is the tenet of the most widespread political party in the civilized world. It is a party that knows no fatherland, as it knows no mother-tongue. It has cut itself free from all the prejudices of language and of traditional methods in government. It is even strong enough to-day to concentrate its forces in some constitutional, elective community, and by a single majority-ballot to take possession of the machinery of government.

The final, adequate end, namely, absolute common ownership, is not stated in its fulness and simplicity in the socialist, collectivist platforms drawn up at the time of municipal and general elections. The collectivism advocated in these programmes is usually limited to those industries where capital has already become sufficiently centralized to manifest the tyranny of monopoly and where the centralization is sufficiently organized to make the transfer to public control an affair of merely passing a law, signing a paper and paying a price. We are not considering here the advantages or disadvantages of *certain* municipal ownerships, as of water, lighting and passenger transport; or of *certain* national ownerships, as of railways, telegraph lines, etc. We are occupied solely with the question of ultimate complete centralization, the abolition of private capital and the common ownership of *all* the means and instruments of production. The tendency of the broad socialistic movement is to *this*, as to an ideal, a goal. We are told that it is only by an ultimate reconstruction of society upon the basis of common ownership that all men will be enabled to receive a wage commensurate with their labor, a compensation due to them for the benefit which by their labor they bestow upon the community. It is seriously important, therefore, to understand at the beginning and to bear constantly in mind that in dealing with the collectivist theory we are dealing with a political theory of *labor* and not with a theory of idleness, anarchy, nihilism, dynamite or free plunder.

In face of this latest scheme for the amelioration of the condition of labor, all the old systems for the reconstruction of society, the systems of St. Simon, of Fourier, etc., have passed into the history of theory. The new system itself is far from being clear, whether as to the details of method or of practically distributed results. However, its fundamental principle, the consolidation and common ownership of all the means and instruments of production, is clearly and unmistakably announced. This principle, at least in partial expression, is found embodied as a political tenet in every socialistic programme that is presented to the people for their suffrage. It is the one point which is found in every socialistic programme without exception. And what is significant of its silent power is that it is recognized by governments the most antagonistic to it as a policy which may be legitimately presented to the people for their election.

In the collectivist theory, then, the one sole cause of all the difficulties with which labor has to contend is free competition in production. This affects everything—the stocking of the market, the wages paid, the price. The wage-earner is at the mercy of the competing capitalist producers. Take away the one cause of the difficulties, take away competition, and the labor question is solved. The only way to be rid of competition is to have no competitors. The only way to be rid of competitors is to have but one producer. The only way to have but one producer is to make all the means and instruments of production absolutely common property and to prohibit all private production for profit or sale.

This collectivism has entered into the field to win not by violence, but by the present conventional political means, that is to say by a majority of votes. Though collectivists feel that just now they cannot get this majority for the establishment of the social state, yet they are sanguine of ultimate success. They rely upon the enemy as their best ally in the destruction of the enemy. Under the conditions of industry which have been brought about by machinery and rapid transport they are waiting for the competitive system to run its course. Within fifty years the old-time conditions—under which the tradesman owned his lot, his shop, his tools and the fruit of his labor, under which he found his own market and regulated supply to demand—have practically disappeared. Small proprietorships of peasant, mechanic, merchant have given way to huge agricultural, industrial and mercantile capitalizations. The process goes on with giant strides. To use the expression of Karl Marx, “one capitalist kills many.” The collectivist, then, is waiting for large capitals to absorb the smaller. He will thus find created for him a few millionaires on the one hand and a race of wage-earners on the other. The essential preparatory work will be done for him (as he could not

do it himself) by the trusts and monopolies, the inevitable outcome of competition. As the capitalists by absorption grow fewer, the workers must increase in numbers, and they must also increase in misery, since they can have nothing to say about production, market or price. This development must go on until the workers revolt by using the legal means of suffrage which has been put into their hands. But when they revolt, it will be as a united, organized, disciplined body, into which they shall have been formed by the very methods of the capitalist system. Then, as capitalists expropriated the many for the benefit of the few, the many will turn around and expropriate the few for the benefit of all. This is the prospective evolution.

The plan of allowing all industries first to reduce themselves to a few controlling centres of capital is comparatively slow of execution. But it is regarded by the collectivist thinker as a necessary preparation of the masses for the final step by which all the centres will be made one. Hence we do not find collectivism attacking centralization. This tolerance it extends even to the matter of huge armies, feeling that when the new era dawns there will be no danger of a military struggle, since the armies will be made up from the ranks of the workers. Therefore, the collectivist leader and thinker is not in a hurry. He knows that from private ownership of all the means of production according to the old competitive method, to common, public ownership of all the means of production, a single leap is an impossibility. He is satisfied with promoting the preparatory work which must necessarily be done, and which is actually being done for him by the monopolies, trusts, huge corporations. These centralizations are an object-lesson which accustoms minds to concede the feasibility of a still more centralized management. In the end, all that the collectivist will have to do will be to unite under one management the two, three or four great corporations of a given industry—steel, coal, oil, paper, sugar, tobacco—and then, at one stroke, by a combination of the industries, to eliminate the slavery condition of private capital and reap the fruit of common ownership.

The present phase of the movement, then, may be designated as one of party organization. The chief stimulus used to effect the organization, one that appeals best to individual sensibilities, is the picturing of the misery of labor. This misery is easily admitted to come precisely from the trust, and the trust is as easily proved to be the necessary consequence of private capital. In this is found a solution of what to many seems a contradiction: namely, on the one hand to expose and deplore the misery that comes from concentrated capital, and on the other hand, negatively to promote the very capitalism that intensifies the misery. But there is a double pur-

pose in it all: first, to show the possibility of a still greater concentration; and secondly, by exhibiting the private monopoly as the necessary consequence of competition, to increase discontent and make the suffering people clamor for what is presented as the sole remedy—the placing of all wagework absolutely under common control. Hence, we see the collectivists refusing to endorse restrictive legislation against trusts, saying that this can only perpetuate the private competition which has been the root of all the misery; and that the only admissible legislation in the matter is that which makes for common ownership.

When we hear them using Proudhon's expression, "Property is robbery," we must be careful to understand that they do not charge the individual property holder of to-day with being a robber. They are attacking a system from which, they concede, the property holder has no escape, but under which the wage earner can never get the value of his work. Under the capitalist system into which competition must necessarily fall, the surplus value of a day's labor, the profit, which once went at least to the small competitor, is now added simply to the accumulations of capital, to minister to the luxury of the few and to strengthen the few in their power of determining the serfdom of the many. The individual capitalist is not blamed for this. He is not accused of personally robbing the wage earner of the surplus value of his work. He is recognized as being the fortunate one in what is called the "anarchy" of competition, an anarchy upheld by civil statute; and so long as he wishes to compete he must abstract as much as he can from the fruit of labor. It is the system, then, which has to be changed. The root has to be dug up. Competition must be eliminated and in its place there must be substituted, also by law, a collective ownership in which there will be no wage earners and no capitalists as persons adequately distinct. All must be producers for their own benefit in the benefit of all.

Once more, we must be on our guard against a prevalent vague notion that the main tenet of the actual socialism, collectivism, is the periodical dividing up and redistribution of all properties, so as to preserve equality of possessions amongst the citizens. Whatever may have been the meaning of some old forms of communism, the collectivism of to-day does not contemplate this at all. It aims simply at common ownership of all the means of production, to the end that each one may receive a wage, a compensation due to him for the labor which he has expended upon the common production.

Still further, we must know that the collectivist system does not propose to dispossess the capitalist brutally, whilst depriving him of the privilege of drawing an interest on his capital or his plant. It

will, of course, prohibit all private industry for profit, and thus all instruments and machinery, as private capital, will become useless. But the collectivist proposes to make some compensation. Private producers will be privileged to transfer their plants to the collective state, and they will receive in return an annuity for a number of years, to be fixed according to the value of what they have transferred. This annuity will be in the form of labor certificates. With these certificates the common produce can be obtained and the common service can be utilized, so that the heretofore capitalist, and perhaps his descendants, may live in luxury for ten or twenty or forty years. But no one of them all may go into business; they may not produce; they may not make their capital grow. When the scrip shall have been used up the descendants shall have to go to work like the rest of the people.

We believe that the foregoing outline contains a very fair statement of the *fundamental tenet* of collectivism. We do not think that in the flood of socialistic journals and pamphlets there will be found a clearer or more comprehensive statement of the first principle of the party which bids for the politico-industrial management of civil society. We have dispensed with citations which, though they might lend an air of erudition, would add nothing to the conviction of a publicly recognized fact.

Now for a practical view of the operation of the fundamental principle let us suppose the collectivist state to be agreed upon, and an effort set on foot to put it into running order. There are three things which we may conceive to be necessary for the very existence and continuance of a civil community along those lines of material civilization with which no one would be willing to dispense. These three things are, briefly, freedom of individual demand, a more or less determinate unit measure of value for the purposes of exchange, and freedom of the individual to choose an occupation and to qualify for the same. No one accustomed to the present material civilization will be willing to change it for a new order of things, unless under that new order he shall be able to provide himself with what he needs, or thinks he needs, as easily as at present; unless he shall have some measure of value and medium of exchange no less convenient than the article which we now call money; and unless he shall have at least the same chance which he now has to select his occupation and to vary the same. In the present advanced stage of material civilization, these three things are necessary as stimulus or aid to the development of individual capacity. Now it has never been demonstrated that a state founded on the fundamental tenet of collectivism can supply these three needs of the individual in the modern civilization.

Take first the case of the supply for every individual demand. First and foremost before all things, what the new collectivist state will have to do will be to regulate supply according to demand. And if that state is to be a success, the supply must be regulated even better than it is to-day. We must understand at the outset that in the new state the entire production, the kind and amount produced and the distribution of all things, in all places, for all emergencies, will necessarily have to be managed by bureaus or committees. It is hardly possible for a human intellect to conceive the enormous governmental machinery which will be required for this one function of the new state. There is here implied not merely the regulation of the supply of coal oil, or shoes, or perfumery, or books, or millinery, or tobacco, or quinine, or coal, of ink, rouge, razors, ice cream, fans, chewing gum—but the supply of each of these and of all of these and of everything, absolutely, that is used and is called for, and of everything that *may* be called for. If that new state cannot and does not actually do this, then instead of being a liberation it will be an enslavement; instead of securing freedom it will open at once as the most galling despotism. In the system of free small competition I can always get what I want. The thing I desire may be useful or it may be useless; but for the moment I imagine that I need it, and so imagining, I can always get it. Under the small competitive system it requires very little demand to induce some one to undertake to supply the demand. I can always find a mechanic who will take my job and try to execute my idea. My idea may not be the most scientific. That matters very little to the mechanic; but it matters much to me, in my present mood, to have my idea carried out. This freedom of individual demand, taken in the aggregate, is a primary essential in the material benefits which man is to draw from civil society. I can always have my demand supplied when there is an individual, personal profit to be made by supplying the demand. But where governmental machinery will have to be moved in order to carry out my odd idea—which to me is a very bright one—and where the committee can look for no special profit, but only for trouble, in deserting its routine, I cannot expect to get the service which I could easily get from the independent tradesman. Anything outside the established routine of production will then be obtainable only under the difficulties which now attend the passage of a law through a City Council.

It is necessary to keep this point in mind: that, in the new state, the total population must inevitably be at the mercy of a ruling committee and of a system of committees, and that it is only through the good will of the committee that an individual can have done for himself what he pleases and when he pleases. In the suppression of

free demand, therefore, by the elimination of free production an insuperable obstacle is put to the development of individuality and to the practical, untrammelled exercise of that inventive spirit upon which the purely material progress of a community depends. The new system thus affects not merely the prospective progress, but also the actual contentment of the community; for there can be no contentment in a community when the individual is prevented from spending his earnings upon the things which he happens to fancy.

It is a patent fact that in the socialistic programmes this difficulty of supply to demand has never been satisfactorily or honestly discussed. There is abundant promise to the proletaire of magnificent festivals, excursions, pageants, concerts which every one will be obliged to take in the crowd. But no regard is shown for that domestic exclusiveness of entertainment and that quiet relaxation which as we all know form the true enjoyment of the better part of the community.

Under this new system, we have to recognize, there will be no usury, no private monopoly. There will be no tenancy or leases, no renting of houses, no real estate agents, no mortgages, no stocks or stock exchanges. There will be no display made by competitors in shop windows, no trading of any kind, no coinage of money, no silver question. Money means private capital that can be introduced into private enterprise for private gain. There could be no private enterprises. There would be only bureaus and committees to decide upon the production and transport of goods, according to the judgment which the committees would be pleased to pass on the needs of the people. If the wives of the bureaus decided that stuffed birds should not be worn on autumn hats, it is reasonable to suppose that there would be no stuffing of birds during the summer, or that there would be a lovely row in the homes of the bureaus. Salesmen and saleswomen would not care what you asked for in return for your certificate of a day's labor. They could have no interest in pleasing you. You would have no chance to toss up the goods on the counters two or three times a week. You would have to know precisely what you wanted when you wandered into the dull warehouse on a bright afternoon. The markets and shops of today are merely a consequence of competitive production. In the new state there would be no occasion for them. There would be no page advertisements of startling bargains in the Sunday newspapers. There could be no advertisements at all. There would be no bargains, for there would be no rival establishments. The newspaper would be no power in trade or politics. There would be no trade. Politics would be a thing of the past, just as rival show rooms and warehouses and those obsolete terms of wholesale and retail.

Where, then, would the interest of the individual be supposed to come in? In this simply, as we have stated, that every man would be supposed to obtain a wage that would be considered to represent the full value of his labor. And this leads to speak of what we placed as a second requisite in the modern civilized State, namely, some approximately fixed and determinable unit measure of value for the purposes of exchange.

In the new state there could be no real money, as we understand the term. With us real money is both measure of value and medium of exchange. In the new state the two functions of money would have to be distributed. They could not be combined in the same article or instrument. As each member of the community would be supposed to be remunerated according to his contribution in labor to the general store or service, labor itself, in some way or other, would necessarily have to be the measure of value. The medium of exchange, then, since the labor or the product could not be passed around, would needs have to be a certificate of labor contributed. This certificate could not be in the form of gold or silver or anything which might have its own value, as a commodity, over and above the labor represented. In the collective state, then, the measure of value would be the labor contributed; and the certificate of labor would be the medium for the purchase of the common produce and the utilization of the common service.

The *labor hour* as the standard measure of value is, indeed, the pivot of the whole collectivist scheme. But it is a pivot which will support nothing; and any scheme which attempts to turn upon it must go to pieces from a thousand and one disasters. Moreover, after going through the long and laborious and specious discussions of Marx and the other collectivist Solons, we discover that it is precisely this solitary, fundamental, essential basis and support of the whole super-structure that they have failed to determine, and that they do not dare to determine.

As a basis for the standard of value and for the medium of exchange there is nothing which I can conceive of as being less determinate or less determinable than the labor hour.

There are two ways only of counting the labor hour: by time employed and by value produced. Is all labor to be paid according to *time* given, with absolute equality? Or is the scrip certificate to have its purchasing power from a given *amount* which has been produced and which shall be regarded as the unit of value? If the labor hour is to be paid by mere time, then, when you are working amongst a hundred men, and you are working harder than the ninety-nine, they will be receiving the fruit of your labor and you will be receiving none of theirs. They will be reducing your wages

and you will be raising theirs. This is against the fundamental tenet of collectivism, *i. e.*, that every man shall receive the full wage due to his labor. In a population of a million you will have to know that 999,999 are working as industriously for you as you are working for them. To be satisfied that the principle is in operation, you must know that you are not laboring to cover over other men's laziness and fraud of time. If you give to each labor hour of the industrious, of the lazy, of the skilled, of the ignorant, the same remuneration it will not take thirty days to banish from the community every indication of industry and skill. In sixty days the collective society will be bankrupt, because there will not be on hand the produce which the scrip calls for. If you get a dollar for your hour's work, no matter how much you do and no matter how you do it, it stands to reason that you shall not expend your energy and care to earn a dollar which you can get with equal certainty for the same slow, heedless hour which your neighbor devotes to the public service of production. It is simply incredible that intelligent collectivists of twenty years ago should not have seen the contradiction between the end intended, *i. e.*, the remuneration of labor to its full value, and the means proposed to accomplish the end, *i. e.*, the measuring of the value of all labor equally by pure duration. The system was certainly very simple. Its simplicity brought it adherents, especially among the indolent. The simple system helped to create the party, and we see it still practically set forth to-day in the unwise demands of some local labor organizations. Still, Marx and other leading collectivists of his day found themselves obliged to recede from too much insistence upon the time measure for the value of the labor hour.

If we take the thing in reason, and in its entirety—as we must always do when discussing a scheme—we have to see that scrip certificates for hours of labor cannot possibly have a purchasing power beyond amount and value produced. A labor hour can give purchasing power to a scrip only by reason of some definite amount produced in the hour of labor. If a thing has not been produced it cannot be purchased. Now, there are no two men whose hour of labor can be counted upon to give exactly the same results. Neither is the labor hour of the same person always uniformly productive. The value of the scrip to have any definite purchasing power must be measured by the minimum production. It stands to reason, then, that each one will produce his minimum, seeing that he can receive no more for the scrip that testifies to his labor. We cannot conceive of the long continuance of a state where every citizen is doing as little as he possibly can to the end that he may not be imposed upon by the idleness of all the other citizens.

The other way, as we have said, of making the hour of labor the measure of value is to take account of what is produced. This is, indeed, to eliminate pure time as a measure of value and to measure value by the need, desirability or mere demand (for demand may not be suppressed) of articles produced and services rendered. An estimate of value will have to be passed on everything that may be demanded. As a certificate scrip for production of one kind will have to be accepted in exchange for service and commodities of every kind, it will be necessary to establish a ratio of value between each resultant of labor and every other resultant of labor. Each resultant of labor through all the stages of production will have to have its schedule of fixed ratios with everything that can be produced and with every service that can be demanded; since the scrip representing it will have to be exchangeable for everything to be found in the community. Now, if as we are told, there is so much difficulty in maintaining a ratio between two metals as unvarying as gold and silver, the supply of which, as inert matter can, in a degree, be regulated, how shall we make up ratios for the labor hours of fifty million persons applying themselves in a million different industries to the production of things that are unequally necessary and of shifting desirability? If pure time measure for the value of the labor hour was marvelously simple, in this other only alternative of the collective state, the establishing of all the ratios, we have something that is no less marvelously complex.

The difficulty of the ratios will become manifest in a brief illustration. Let us take simply the *final* labor expended upon the finishing of a *few* articles that are now produced. Let us say, merely by way of example, that for this finishing labor A produces in an hour 30 pairs of suspenders; B produces 80 gallons of molasses; C, the milliner, produces 1 spring hat; D produces 9 kegs of nails; E produces 25 gross of wooden toothpicks; F produces 19 gross of hairpins, and G produces 1 violin. We are taking only a few articles, and we are considering only the last touches upon these articles. We are not considering the multifarious distinct kinds of productive labor hours that have previously been given. For this we should have to introduce the ploughing of fields, the planting of cotton and cane and flax, the mining, the smelting of copper and tin and iron, the felling of trees, the sawing of wood, the harvesting and gathering and carding and spinning and weaving, the manufacture of machinery, the transport, the storing, the dispensing for distribution of material, etc., etc. We leave all this out, though it would have to be introduced in the complete scheme even for these few articles as well as for a million more. Now, taking the labor of the finishing touches, where is the labor of the most value? Sit down

for a year with your pencil and paper and work out the answer. Take your ten years or twenty. You cannot do it. Half the world believes that a working equivalent cannot be found between two pure metals, silver and gold. How shall it be found between a million, between fifty million articles produced, between all the various kinds of labor results contributing to their final production? What is the relative value of the labor hour employed in weeding a potato patch as compared with that devoted to sewing on glove buttons? How many dozen glove buttons will balance an acre of potatoes? If you are a collectivist and do not wish to commit yourself to paying for mere time, independently of what is done, you will be obliged to establish this little ratio, together with a million more. You will, besides, be obliged to reestablish the ratios every day according to the fluctuating value put upon anything and everything by the changing tastes of the community.

But let us suppose that you have succeeded in laying down a few ratios between commodities or various kinds of public service, say, between street cleaning, making ice cream, playing the bass drum and pulling teeth. The ratios could not be established with anything like the exactness of the ratio that can be established between silver and gold. But let us suppose that you have succeeded in working out the six ratios, showing the value of each of these kinds of labor hour in terms of each of the others. How are you going to decide who is to have the privilege of applying himself to the most lucrative kind of labor? Who shall be obliged to take the labor that is less remunerated, even whilst he is willing and anxious and competent to do the better rewarded labor? In fairness there can be but one way to determine the individuals who are to have the preference: an examination test, established for every occupation and free to all comers. The whole land will be turned into a school of civil service contests. If you do not wish this endless examination, which will stop the wheels of business, you have but one alternative: you must allow the members of the committees to give the best places to their friends—and within sixty days you will have the community in a bloody revolution.

We dismiss altogether the question of hard labor, which has been utterly unproductive for the community, a question that must arise in regard to agricultural labor whenever there is a failure of the crops. Time measure here could be the only measure, and time measure, as we have seen, would mean the minimum of food.

In regard to this third point, namely, choice of occupation, let us take a single case in the higher professions. In the collective state, who will be the physicians? If there are to be physicians, they will, of course, have to be educated at the public expense. As the young

men to be educated cannot be expected to have laid by any labor certificates to serve for their support during the time of their medical studies, it is clear that they will have to receive for their hours of study—say eight hours per diem—corresponding labor certificates as for so many hours spent in the public service. And, indeed, their services will have to be specially remunerated; for as they will be deprived of the active, open-air exercise which is the privilege of those who labor in the fields, they will require a more easily digested and hence a more costly nourishment. The daily bacon and corn-bread which would be the delight of the herdsman and of the log-roller would bring chronic dyspepsia to the medical aspirant; and it is important, as a matter of grave moment in therapeutics, that the physicians who survive should not all be dyspeptic.

They will all have to be fittingly supported during their studies. This being fixed, there arises the problem of the selection of candidates. Let us suppose that one hundred physicians are considered to be sufficient for a given quadrangle of the collective state. How shall they be chosen? All the boys and girls of ten years of age will have a right to demand that they be educated for the medical profession. Here at the start there is an insuperable difficulty. But let us suppose that at length four thousand young men and women of the age of twenty years present themselves to begin the medical studies. Out of these it may be necessary to select three hundred, in order to make allowance for death and failure. The selection will have to be made by a committee. Will it select at random? That would not be justice to the community. Will it select its friends? That would not be the equality of distributive justice which is the professed aim of the collective state. Will it select according to previous examinations in schools of arts and letters? Knowledge of arts and letters is not a criterion of certain very important qualifications which should be looked for in those to whom the lives of the community are to be entrusted. There are certain moral and physical qualities which can exhibit themselves only in the course of practice, and which—any physician will attest it—go far to make up the necessary equipment of the medical practitioner who is to be of real value to the community. These things cannot be foreseen by any committee. Hence no committee can make a fit selection of subjects for education in medicine.

We shall, nevertheless, suppose that the committee does make a selection of the three hundred who are to pursue the medical studies. As we have said, these students will have to receive their salary or wages for study. What guarantee can we have that they will really fit themselves for the best public service? For, the practice of medicine will have to be a public service, since there can be

no competition. No more can be done than to establish a minimum percentage which one must reach in order to be accepted as the public servant. And in the doing of this the entire medical profession is reduced to a minimum of excellence. For, nine-tenths of those who, under the system of private competition, would have labored for a maximum of excellence, will, under the new system, labor only for the minimum which is demanded for the earning of the daily wage in the public service—the only thing they can aspire to. In a word, the entire profession is degraded, and the entire community is put at the mercy of half-educated charlatans. Drugs, medicines, under the new system, will have to be as free as water. The members of the community, on labor hour certificates, cannot be expected to lay by enough to cover the expenses of a long illness. Everything for the infirm and the incapacitated will have to be done by public hospital service. But where nurses and doctors and all entrusted with the health of the citizens are qualified for their service by a minimum examination, we may well pity the community that is subjected to the collusion of such servants whose wages are independent of the efficiency of their service.

This is but one illustration which we have chosen to pursue out of a hundred thousand. The collectivists do not go into these details. They are careful to avoid such details. They keep on crying, "The fruit of labor for the workman and down with capital." They pose as reformers; but their reform when investigated is seen to consist simply in tearing down and not in building. In no one of their programmes have they presented a practical satisfactory detail upon any point of the new system which they offer to establish.

We may remark here that it is a necessary consequence of the collectivist scheme that every person who is at least *willing* to work must be entitled to the labor wage. Hence it must be a socially inevitable fact that at all times there shall be many who shall receive the labor wage whilst doing no work. For it is impossible that *all* persons in the same locality shall always be producing. Yet such persons are fully entitled to the labor wage, for the principle of equality demands that it be not arbitrarily given to one in preference to another. If, however, actual labor should be counted a necessary condition for the receipt of the wage, then those for whom there would be nothing to do in a locality would have to be transported at public expense to another locality where labor would be possible. Thus there would be an endless shifting of populations; there would be a continual breaking up of families—a vital blow given to one of the fundamentals of human liberty.

To return to the second of our questions, the new socialism has set itself the task of specifying what it means by the labor hour as

the measure of value—whether that measure is to be the time of the labor or the utility, necessity, desirability of the result: the hour or the product. As we have seen, the product must necessarily enter into the standard. But, as we have also seen, this will give us a standard the most fickle, fluctuating and complex that could possibly be devised. For the purpose of avoiding a more bewildering complexity we have omitted to hint that even the use value of a product could be justly decided upon in no other way than by the voice of the whole community. If a few individuals want a certain article and this article has to be produced for them, the labor expended for their idea would be so much labor taken from the production of what is really desired and used by the whole community; and it is, therefore, by reason of the diminution of the supply, an increase in the price of the commodity that is demanded by all. Socialist leaders see their dilemma. Hence they are reticent or over-cautious in their expressions upon the use value of labor. They are apprehensive of the shoal of rocks upon which their phantom ship must go to pieces. For the most part, therefore, we find them still *specifying* by the *time* and *glossing over* the general *use value* of the labor in which the time is spent. But this mere time value, the equal wage for all time service, is the most galling civic tyranny that can be exercised upon the intelligence, industry and enterprise of a population.

Unfortunately, it is precisely this prospective despotism to be exercised over the attentive, the careful, the industrious and the conscientious that has contributed as much as anything else to swell the ranks of the new socialism as a political party. The lazy, the chronic grumblers, the dissatisfied, the improvident are swept into the political maelstrom by the momentum of their own inertia. The deeds of the socialists in Italy and Belgium during the past two years are evidence of the methods by which a dangerous class of men, under the name of a recognized political party, are ready to execute their programme the world over. Debarred from political recognition under their own name or tenets, we find promoting the socialistic demands that entire class which, with change of time or locality, has made up what has been known as nihilism, the internationale, the commune, the "reds"—the class that has wrought all the destructive revolutions from the days of the "Terror." There are certainly intelligent and able men at the head of the collectivist movement. But so were there intelligent and sincere men at the head when the reform of the last century began; but they were swept away by a turbulent sea. It is the time-standard for the value of labor which has, for the present, merged into the social collectivist party that entire class which wants a paternal state where there will

be a wage for every hour; where a committee, representing the paternity of the state, will set the task, and where no one will have a chance to grow rich.

It is precisely the promotion of this socialistic time pay principle which has done most, primarily, to bring dishonor and discredit upon what ought to be, as five centuries ago it used to be, the most potent force to keep the social equilibrium. I mean the trades guild or labor union. The trade union has often enough alienated its friends and set itself in antagonism to those who would have been its best support, by insisting upon the time employed rather than upon the excellence of the work done as the measure of the labor wage. It would be interesting to learn how far the application of this socialistic principle, as the working basis of certain trades unions, has been responsible for some of the uncomfortable strikes by which communities have been afflicted. I have seen as many as seven hundred operatives walk out of one establishment because the manager refused to pay the wages of the skilled laborer to one man who was not skilled and who could not do the work that was called for. The union insisted upon his having the full wage simply because he was a member of the union. And because the manager would not sanction this socialistic tyranny the whole establishment went out upon a strike by order of the dictator.

We have said nothing of the attitude of the new socialism toward religion. Our purpose has been solely to consider the political possibility of the economic scheme as judged by its fundamental principle. The religious attitude of the polity would be matter for special consideration. This much, however, may be said, that the general literature of the movement, together with the character of a vast body of men from whom it is getting its support, leave no room to conjecture that it would or could be other than strictly materialistic, that is atheistic and purely irreligious.

Taking, then, the temporal view alone, we have to remember that there is no temporal advantage which can compensate a man for the loss of his individuality, his personal liberty, his native autonomy. In this view the development of individuality implies the right to earn and the right to learn. From what we have said it ought to be manifest that the collectivist paternalism stands in the way of individual development by practically forbidding the untrammelled exercise of the right to earn. But the scheme is equally obstructive of individual development in the other way, and as thus obstructive it is, perhaps, the more imminent danger to us at the present hour. There is a slavery not alone of the body, but also of the soul. Besides the slavery of matter there is a slavery of mind. There can be a slavery not only of muscular energy, but even of the

energies of thought. And it is precisely in the intellectual sphere—even in the temporal order—that collectivism is to exercise its most disastrous effects upon the native liberties of the individuals of the collection. Under the system the individual cannot be privileged to get the education which he knows to be best, whether for himself or for his children. The entire management of the intellectual culture will necessarily be in the hands of the bureaus. If the bureaus decide that a certain book is not to be printed, it shall not be printed. It will be consigned to oblivion with its author. If the author does not choose to write so as to suit the ideas of the committee, he cannot get into print; for the entire plant will be at the dictate of the committee. The committee cannot print everything at everybody's request. It will have to make a selection; and it will select according to its prejudices.

The most terrible tyranny, then, of the collectivist state will be the tyranny over thought. It might be a surprise to many to hear it affirmed that where they would look last for the realization of the paternal despotism, namely, in the domain of truth and the realms of thought, right there has the collectivist principle found its most comprehensive application. Men who would repudiate scornfully the imputation of an alliance with the collective socialist movement are doing more than any other class to promote that movement and to prove its feasibility. It is in the advocacy of control of the thoughts of the young through committees and bureaus that the new socialism is striking its strongest blows, silently and with telling effect. If people are not now willing to be awakened to the truth of this they shall awake upon a day to find that their sons and daughters have been led into an intellectual captivity such as has not been since the beginning of the world.

WILLIAM POLAND, S. J.

St. Louis University.

MEGA SPELÆON, OR THE MONASTERY OF THE GREAT CAVE.

IN the early years of its existence monastic life was identical in the East and in the West. But this identity rapidly disappeared. For while the Western monk, more active and sympathetic than his Eastern prototype, could not hold himself aloof from the temporal and spiritual welfare of his fellow-Christians, the Eastern monk became more and more selfish, spent his religious solicitude in caring for no one's soul or body except his own; and while remaining a passionate defender of Eastern dogma, never was wor-

ried by the duty of laboring either with hand or with intellect for the amelioration of the moral condition of other men.

The Western monk interested himself in the daily life of the people and rivaled the lay-priest's care of souls. His superiority of learning and austerity of life rendered him more efficient than his secular confrère, and the result was that the lay-priest had to imitate him, and practically became a monk, in order not to lose his sway and influence. The Western lay-priest accordingly accepted the celibacy and office and secluded life of the monk, remaining different only by his not taking up his abode within the walls of a monastery. This influence, however, was mutual, and not all from one side, as is evident. Although each set of clergy, by a kind of natural fitness, devoted itself rather to one kind of work than to another, yet no kind was exclusive property. In reality, therefore, the religious of the West differs from the secular only in the very unimportant accidentals of dress and routine of life.

While, then, the priests of the West are practically all monks, and the monks of the West have nearly all become secular, this useful amalgamation has not taken place in the East. There the secular priest has accepted almost nothing from the regular; and the monk although in some countries, as in Russia, encroaching on the domain of the secular priest, has not assimilated himself unto him. This lack of assimilation is as natural in the East as it would have been strange in the West. For in the East the monk has really no qualities exclusively his that would add lustre to the life of other men; and the secular has no special virtues distinguishing him from any good member of his flock that the religious might be moved to emulate.

In Greece and Turkey monasticism has essentially remained what it was centuries ago; and in this connection it is not out of place to remember that what does not change and grow, if a thing of life, is probably in the stage of decline or decrepitude. Monasticism is not, however, on the same level in all parts of the East. In some countries, as in most of Russia, it is still in vigorous activity. In Greece, however, it has become a useless institution, and unless renewed by being thoroughly reformed, will soon lose what little influence it still possesses.

The following historical and descriptive sketch of one of the most noted monasteries of the East, and the most celebrated and popular one of the modern kingdom of Greece, will, at least indirectly, furnish some idea of what monasticism has been here what it is, and what the Greeks think of it. My judgments, if not formed on theirs, agree therewith. They properly respect the monasteries and monks not exclusively in proportion to their worth to-day, but also in rela-

tion to their historic past. My sketch will follow this idea, and will describe the monastery as it appeals to the Greek, and as it really is.

Mega Spelæon is not the only famous monastery of free Greece. For Hagia Lavra in Arkadia, the Meteora in Thessaly, the Taxiarchs near Ægion and others also have their peculiar historic reputation. But Mega Spelæon has been more closely connected with the varied life and fortunes of the people, and has partaken of their aspirations more than any of these others. It is also the largest in respect of the number of monks and the most noted in respect of wealth.

Mega Spelæon is located in the northern part of the Peloponnesos and in the province of ancient Arkadia, near to where the mountains of Arkadia join the neighboring ones of Achaia. It is situated high on the slope of a long cliff overlooking the rocky bed of the Erasinos river, which brings down into the Korinthian Gulf portion of the waters of the Aroanian and Erymanthian mountains. The monastery stands about one mile above the river, to the east.

Formerly Mega Spelæon was quite difficult of access. It could be reached only on foot or by pony, as no wagon road either in ancient or in modern times has been cut across these Arkadian cliffs. The nearest centres of civilization in the late middle ages, and up to the present time, were the village of Kerpine, where the French chieftains of Charpigny built one of their fortresses, and which is distant by a walk of two hours; the town of Kalabryta, distant to the south more than two hours; Korinth, sixteen hours away towards the rising sun, and Patræ, twelve hours towards the west. Now, however, a pilgrimage to Mega Spelæon involves no unpleasant journeying whatsoever. In 1895 a military railroad was built through the gorge of the Erasinos, and thus easy communication now exists between Northern Arkadia and the Korinthian Gulf. This railroad is of the toothed kind. The ascent is in some places dangerously steep, as can be judged from the fact that the station in Kalabryta, although distant only twenty-one kilometres from the station near the gulf, is two thousand one hundred and seventy-five feet higher. The ride up this incline is wonderful. The train, consisting of an engine and one open car, creeps up along its rocky path, over waterfalls, under tunnels, over high and short bridges, under cliffs so tall that one cannot see the top from the cars at times, with the Erasinos surging and boiling alongside. Just below the monastery is a small village with the strange name of Zachlorou, where the cars stop. Zachlorou is nineteen hundred and fifty feet high, although it is distant only eleven kilometres from the gulf. From Zachlorou to the monastery, which is

about ten hundred and fifty feet above the station at an angle of about forty degrees, the ascent is made by donkey along a zig-zag path. About half an hour is required to make the ascent.

The history of the monastery has been written by one of the most noted of modern scholars in the Greek Church, *Œkonomos ex Œkonomon*. It was published in the year 1840, under the title of "*Ktitorikon or Proskyneterion of Mega Spelæon*," in Greek. But the early centuries of the history of the monastery are so enveloped in obscurity and pious story that they cannot be clearly examined. Its later history, however, and the part it took in the stirring events that occurred in Greece at the beginning of the present century are well known.

It seems probable that the original monastery was established on the exact site of the present one, that is, in the cave from which the institution takes its name. The custom of founding monasteries and churches in caves was a frequent one during the early and middle ages of Christianity. It came in part from the habit which the anchorites cultivated of not surrounding themselves with anything that resembled artificial luxury. To such men these caves afforded a natural, easy and sufficient shelter. All throughout the East may be found monasteries that originated from a cave and a cave-dwelling anchorite.

It is this spacious grotto, then, that furnished to the monastery its name of *Mega Spelæon*, or the Great Cave. Ecclesiastically it should rather be called "the monastery of the Assumption," since it is established in honor of the Blessed Virgin, and celebrates with special pomp the feast of the 15th of August in her honor. But the other name is the only one in official as well as in popular use. And a precious image of the Blessed Virgin, which is kept here, is known everywhere throughout Greece, in its copies, as the "*Panagia Megaspelæotissa*," or the Madonna of the Great Cave.

The cave itself is about ninety feet high and one hundred and eighty feet long. It is on the mountain side, at the foot of a towering and perpendicular face of solid rock that rises about five hundred feet straight in the air above it. It is quite deep, so that the principal building of the monastery is entirely within it and beneath its roof. And a stone rolled from the summit of the cliff above will fall clear of this cavity and the monastery.

From a distance the monastery can be seen only from the mountain heights west of the longitude of the cave. Mysteriously picturesque does it appear from the top of the ruined citadel of the Frankish knights of La Tremoille near Kalabryta, and from a few points along the banks of the Erasinós, especially from a place called "the Maiden's fount," and from the higher parts of the opposite

village of Zachlorou. But from a distance it is very difficult to find a point from which all the buildings are visible, because from most of the neighboring lookouts a portion of the group of curious buildings, and oftenest the principal one, is hidden behind some mountain projection. Most often only the old tower on the edge of the cliff above the monastery can be seen, the tower built as a defense against the Egyptian army of Ibraim Pasha in 1827.

The principal building is mostly seven stories high. The lower portion is built of stone and the upper stories of wood. Most of this stone portion is about four stories high; but since its various sections do not all begin from the same ground level it does not all rise to the same horizontal line at the top. Indeed one could easily think that irregularity in lines and lack of symmetry were intentionally provided for by the successive architects of the buildings. The façade of this central building forms not a straight line, but an irregular segment of a circle, following the contour of the cave. It is the custom here in Greece to cover the roofs of houses with brick tiles. This, however, cannot be done at Mega Spelæon, because in winter gigantic icicles form on the rocky side of the cliffs above and fall with tremendous force upon the monastery. These roofs have therefore to be made of thick planks, capable of resisting the violence of the falling ice.

A characteristic of the Greek is that he never makes repairs. This truth is well illustrated here at the monastery. Nothing after being once constructed is ever restored, and injured parts are never renewed if possible until progressing decay necessitates complete demolition and reconstruction. Accordingly, the various buildings with their crooked lines and unsymmetrical shapes are made even more picturesque by their rickety and dilapidated appearance.

In front of the monastery, towards the Erasinós, the higher slopes of the mountain side are all carefully terraced and cultivated. Various kinds of vegetables and fruits are raised here by the monks, each one of whom, assisted by his famulus, tills a small patch, from which he supplies his table. These terraces and hanging gardens are separated off from each other by supporting walls of stone and by irregular rows of trees and flowering shrubbery. The walls are covered with masses of ivy and wild vines in most luxuriant profusion. A number of these enchanting gardens can be seen from the windows of the monastery. Nightingales and other sweet-voiced birds fill the air with music morning and evening. The monks have the good quality of being lovers of nature. And the slovenliest of them will cultivate a few flowers in his garden, and perhaps have a song bird in his cell. Having once climbed to the top of the cliffs that overhang the monastery to the tower where Ibraim's Egyptians

were repulsed, I came suddenly upon a priest robed in cassock and kalimavki standing statue quiet in among the bushes, and on inquiry learned from him that his lonely posing was due to his watching some young bullfinches which had just left their nest. He had already caught one and had it imprisoned, chirping and fluttering, in the pocket of his cassock. He said that he wanted them for his cell, as the bullfinch is an excellent songster. But when I met him again, a few days later, he hastened to tell me with sorrow that his prisoners of melodious hopes had died.

The story which the monks narrate as to why the site was selected is that within the cave an image of the Madonna was discovered by a native shepherdess of Zachlorou, a pious girl named Evphrosyne, and that in consequence of this discovery two monks from Thessalonika, Saints Symeon and Theodoros, built a church and cells in the cave, and took up their abode in it. That the monastery is extremely ancient is beyond all doubt. And the tradition which asserts that it was founded by these two saints in the fourth century is perhaps not widely incorrect. The tradition is confirmed by the office which the monks sing in memory of its reputed founders, Symeon and Theodoros, who along with Evphrosyne are commemorated as local saints on the 18th of October. Archæological methods of reasoning bring the researcher back towards that period. And since the fourth century saw monasteries founded in many other parts of the Christian world, we do not yield much to tradition by not positively rejecting for the origin of Mega Spelæon a date so early.

In the year 1641 a terrible conflagration visited the monastery and consumed everything—the buildings, the church, the library and the archives. Nothing of importance within the buildings escaped the flames except the image of the Madonna, which the monks carried off to a place of safety. This annihilation of all older monuments and destruction of the records is what renders the early history of the monastery so obscure. Fortunately a few important documents were saved because they happened to be kept at that time not in the monastery, but in one of its various “metochia” or succursals. Among these were three golden imperial bulls from Constantinopol.

Documents have been preserved which show that the church which was reduced to ashes by the conflagration of 1641 had been rebuilt or renewed from still older foundations in the year 1285 with money sent from Constantinopol by the Emperor Andronikos II. One might suppose that since the Peloponnesos was at that time under the rule of the Franks, it was strange for an Emperor of Constantinopol to become the benefactor of a monastery within their

dominions. But there could not have been much difficulty in doing so, for Villeharduin and his successors, who since the Fourth Crusade in 1204 held most of the Peloponnesos, never cut the church of their Greek subjects loose from Byzantine influence. Besides, the gift of Andronikos need indicate no imperial sway over the country. And moreover at that time the Emperor could hope for the return of the Peloponnesos to his dominions, for it was just then very carelessly governed from the West. It had lately been added to the possessions of Charles of Anjou, King of Naples. The King of Naples died in this year, and his successor, Charles II., was a prisoner in the hands of the King of Arragon. And his Viceroy, Robert, provided temporarily for the Peloponnesos by placing it under the care of the Duke of Athens, Guillaume de la Roche. But Guillaume had nearer and more vital interests in his own dukedom, and the Frankish possessions of the Peloponnesos were open to continual attacks from the garrisons of the Byzantine forts of Monembasia and Lakedæmon. It is also well known that Andronikos was a religious man. He followed the views of those that had opposed the ikonoklasts, being in favor of the images, and therefore was naturally well disposed towards a monastery where was venerated a picture of the Madonna reputed to be from the hand of the Apostle St. Luke. He also sent to the monastery one of the three golden bulls mentioned above.

The Megaspelæotes, after this fire of 1641, immediately set about rebuilding the church and monastery. Within the following year a good portion of the work was completed. And in the year 1653 the church, which had already been entirely rebuilt, was frescoed, as is testified to by an inscription over the great door of the narthex.

This new church, which dates from 1641, is probably, like the one that had been destroyed by the fire, a good specimen of the Byzantine style of ecclesiastical architecture. The church is not visible from without, as it is on the third floor of the principal building, and has no separate façade of its own. The main part of the church is in the form of a square, in the middle of which four pillars support a beautiful dome. As is usual in the East, the sanctuary is separated from the body of the church by a wall called the Eikonostasion. Three doorways lead through the Eikonostasion from the body of the church into the sanctuary. This eikonostasion is extremely rich, being of wood intricately carved and covered with gold. When looking at it one cannot fail to recall the luxurious Rococo ornamentations so much favored by the Jesuits in Italy and other parts of Europe. The eikonostasion receives its name from the fact that it is decorated with the eikons or images of Christ as King of Kings,

the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, St. John the Baptist and the patron saints of the church.

To the right of the worshipers, in this eikonostasion, is the great treasure of the monastery, the image already mentioned, the Madonna which was saved from the fire of 1641, and which the tradition of the monks attributes to the hand of St. Luke. It is not a painting on canvas or on a flat surface, but is a carved image in high relief, made of wood and representing the Virgin holding the Child in her lap. It is probably a very old work. That it was, however, made by the Apostle seems to be merely a bit of pious credulity which adds to the incomes as well as to the fame of the monastery. The image is covered with a kind of wax, which the monks profess to know to be mastic. It has become very black with age and with the smoke of incense. The image may possibly be technically classed with those called "kerochyt," and finished by a process called "kerographia."

The decorations of the church of Mega Spelæon are rich and heavy. The effect is added to by the fact that the overhanging cave shuts out almost all the light of day from the little windows in the dome, allowing the church to be illuminated only by the softened light which streams in from the narthex through the open doorway, and by the candles and olive oil lamps that burn in front of the eikons. The walls are one solid mass of frescoes in heavy colors. These frescoes represent prophets and apostles and martyrs and saints and holy persons thousands in number, who seem in the dimness to be standing behind the stalls of the monks and listening with mysterious attention to the chants of the Holy Office. In the middle of the floor beneath the dome is carved in marble the two-headed eagle of the Emperors of Byzantium, which the Tsars of Russia have appropriated. It may be seen in all Greek temples of importance that were built while the Greek Church here was subject to Constantinopol. The entrance into the main portion of the church from the outside narthex is through a doorway which is closed by two massive doors of brass, made in Lebadeia in 1805. They are covered with figures and groups of figures in low relief, not of good but of pleasing art. Outside of these gates is the outer narthex, or vestibule, where those who come to visit the church may sit till the doors be opened.

Besides this church there are several small chapels. The church is called "katholikon," or "katholikos naos," because into it gather the "entire" community for such services as are intended for "all." The smaller chapels are five in number, one of them being sacred to St. Luke, as the painter of the miraculous image, and another to St. Evphrosyne, to whom the place of the hidden image was re-

vealed. Sick persons who are often brought to the monastery to be relieved of their sufferings are placed in the chapel of St. Evphrosyne. It is so small that no more than three or four persons can enter it at once. As a rule these chapels are used only when more than one Mass is to be said; for, according to the canons of the Eastern Church, not more than one Mass may be celebrated at the same altar on the same day. Such a coincidence, however, is not so very frequent. For the priests usually celebrate Mass only when they have "intentions."

This monastery of Mega Spelæon belongs to the class called "stavropegiac." Stavropegiac churches and monasteries are entirely independent of the authority of the bishop and other local ecclesiastical authority in the diocese where they are established. They depend directly on the Patriarch of Constantinopol. The local bishop cannot interfere in the appointment of the abbot, in the admission of novices, or in the administration of the property of the monastery. Nor is he specially commemorated in the office and Mass. But these privileges are here in Greece now merely an empty historic title, for shortly after the establishment of the kingdom of Greece the Church was declared to be independent of the Patriarch, and Constantinopol now has no authority whatsoever over this and other such monasteries, the head of the Church in Greece being the Metropolitan Archbishop of Athens. At present the Mega Spelæon is supposed to be subject to the bishop of the diocese of Kalabryta and Ægialeia. But the see of this diocese has been vacant for years, and probably will long remain so. The vicars, who reside in Kalabryta and administer the affairs of the "widowed" diocese, as they call it, bother themselves very little about Mega Spelæon.

In consequence of its fame and high protection, Mega Spelæon became very wealthy. By legacies and other gifts it came into possession of property in every part of the Hellenic world, in European Turkey, in Asia Minor and in North Greece, besides its numerous possessions in the Peloponnesos. This wealth and property were secured to it repeatedly by imperial and patriarchal bulls. A number of the later patriarchal bulls referring to the monastery and its property are still in existence and are kept in the library. Of the imperial bulls only one is still in the possession of the monastery, that of John Kantakouzen, written in 6856 anno Mundi, that is 1358 A. D. Possibly Kantakouzen's bull was occasioned by the events of 1320. In that year the country round about Mega Spelæon passed again under the control of the Emperors, owing to the victories of the Byzantine general, Andronikos Asan. This change of rulers probably brought with it disputes as to the legality of the

titles which the monastery held to some of its lands. And the object of the bull was to prevent greedy laymen from appropriating to themselves fields and forests belonging to the monastery. The bull may have been obtained through influence with the son of Kantakouzen, Manouel, who in this year was appointed Byzantine general in the Peloponnesos and established the seat of government in the Lakonian town of Mithra.

Similar circumstances later occasioned the loss of two of these imperial bulls. In 1684 the Republic of Venice declared war anew against the Sultan, and her armies, under the leadership of Morosini, succeeded in liberating the entire Peloponnesos from his yoke. By the treaty of Carlovich in 1699 the Peloponnesos was accordingly declared to be a Venetian possession. This new change of masters again occasioned disputes as to the legal ownership of certain lands which the monastery claimed. And to vindicate their rights the monks in the year 1715 sent to the government of the doges the three bulls in question, in order that the Republic might renew the privileges therein granted. Venice, however, did not pay much attention to the affair, probably foreseeing that her hold on the Peloponnesos was but temporary, and that it would not seriously benefit either monastery or Venice to restudy the questions at issue, as the possessions in dispute were liable at any time to again fall under Turkish rule. And in fact in 1713 war broke out afresh. Then Zacchæos, the monk who had brought the bulls to Venice, returned to his monastery so as to be with it in the dangers of war. In his hurry to depart from Venice he deposited the bulls with one of the secretaries of the government. The result of this war was that in 1715 the Grand Vizier Ali Koumourtzi had easily reconquered all of the Peloponnesos. After peace was restored the monks, being no longer subjects of Venice, asked for the return of their valuable parchments. The request was not readily complied with. And after much delay they were glad to recover the latest of the three, that of Kantakouzen; but even from this one the golden medallion or seal had been removed. Where this medallion now is, as well as the fate of the other two bulls, is not known. But they are probably in some historical collection somewhere.

The wealth of the monastery was so great that not many years ago the income annually was more than four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000). This made a yearly allowance for each monk of about fourteen hundred dollars. In those days the number of monks approached to three hundred. Now they are not more than one hundred and fifty. Of late years the income is not greater than perhaps twenty thousand dollars. There is no way of discovering the exact sum, although the abbot and counselors are supposed to

render to the government a detailed account every year. There has, however, undoubtedly been a great decrease in the revenues of the monastery, both because it has gradually lost much of the property that it possessed outside of the Peloponnesos, and also because of the increasing laziness of the monks. The government of Greece, which is always hard pressed for funds, taxes this and all other monasteries quite severely, making it necessary for the monks either to become industrious or else to suffer somewhat by privation. Most of the monks prefer the second of the two evils.

A great portion of monastic property has been confiscated. Indeed it is quite probable that the government would mercilessly confiscate all valuable monastic property, were it not that by doing so it would commit the diplomatic blunder of giving the example to the Sultan. In Turkey there is a great deal of property in the possession of Greek monasteries. And these monasteries in Turkey have not lost their usefulness to Greece and the Hellenic cause. Accordingly it is to the interest of Greece to be solicitous that the monasteries within Turkish territory be not interfered with by the government of the Sultan. And therefore it cannot give the example of high-handed confiscation of similar property at home. Still confiscation quietly does go on. The ground on which the American School of Classical Studies in Athens stands once belonged to the monastery of the Angels. And there have not been wanting among the members of the Congress slavish men who have been looking about through monastic property to find a suitable tract to confiscate and donate to the third son of the King, since his older brothers have already been provided for. Mega Spelæon, however, will not be confiscated, for the entire nation would resist such an act.

The life of the anchorite has always had a great fascination for the Christian Greek. And monasteries have always been numerous in Greek lands. In Turkish times they were in many respects useful. The monasteries then were places where more or less of Greek and Christian learning was diffused and where Christians could occasionally assemble and feel that they were not under the eye of spies. The monks continued to care for the treasures of literary antiquity, or at least to sell them to Europeans, thus preventing their complete loss. Many became monks because few other professions then brought any kind of personal security together with a little honor. The Turk nearly always respected the monk.

The Greek Church has almost ceased to be a teacher. She no longer can be regarded as laboring intelligently in directing or forming the morals of the people. She presents herself to the Greek as a serious and energetic authority in no other domain than that of religion and religious rites. Every historian knows that at times there exists a divorce between morals and religion, and that people

become careless or unaware of the connection between the two. This is unfortunately now approaching to be a fact in Greece. The Greek is not a bad man by any means, but it is not evident that he owes his virtue to his Church. In accordance with this view of religion the Greek who becomes a novice in a monastery is attracted not so much by the morality of monastic life as by its religiousness. And he and his friends think himself benefited by his becoming a monk, although he brings with him only the most ordinary virtues, and all of these he is by no means sure either of cultivating or of increasing.

At Mega Spelæon each monk may, if he chooses, keep under his direction one or more young boys, who after reaching the age of twenty-five years and spending three years in their patron's service as novices, may receive tonsure and become monks. The monastery as such rarely accepts novices. But the individual monks, as individuals, according to their own absolutely free choice, take these boys, who, known as "hypotaktikoi," that is "famuli," act as servants to their patron, and at the same time learn how to live a monastic life. They also often become the inheritors of his personal property. A not entirely unfounded opinion prevails that sometimes these famuli have reasons by paternity as well as by this spiritual adoption to be regarded as the proper heirs of their patrons.

The monks of Mega Spelæon belong to the class called "idorhythmic." As such they are to be distinguished from those others of the "cenobiac" type. Cenobiac monks live a life in common. All are under the direction of the abbot and the council, and must labor for the common good of the monastery, according to the will of their superiors. All eat at the same table. Food as well as clothing and other necessities are supplied from the common funds of the monastery. The idiorhythmic life, however, is very different. Each member of the community is to a great degree independent. He is indeed subject to certain general regulations, but can direct and employ most of his life as he wishes. At Mega Spelæon each monk receives from the common income and property of the monastery an amount of bread and wine and cheese sufficient for his support and that of his famulus. A small garden is also allotted to him in which he raises fruits and vegetables and salads for his table. He eats in his own cell, attended by his famulus, who prepares his food. There is no common table whatsoever.

Since wine and bread are common property, each monk is obliged to be ready to assist, either he or his famulus, in the cultivating of the fields that produce the wheat, in the irrigating of these fields and the vineyards, in the harvesting of the wheat and the gathering and pressing of the grapes. But as most of the lands are tilled by

Vol. XXVI—Sig. 6.

hired men or are pacted out to farmers, these labors occupy but a small fraction of his time. If he holds any office in the monastery or performs any duties other than those mentioned he receives a proportionate salary. The religious exercises in the church go on regularly, but he may attend or not almost as he pleases. And surely except on Sundays and feast days he is absent much more frequently than he is present.

The bread and wine and cheese, which is doled out free to all, is produced from the farms and vineyards and pasture lands of the monastery. In the wine cellar there are two famous old wine casks called "Stamates" and "Evangelios." Stamates holds twelve thousand okes, or nearly four thousand gallons. Evangelios formerly was much larger than Stamates, but one end of the cask decayed and had to be sawed off, so that Evangelios now contains only nine thousand okes, or somewhat less than three thousand gallons.

Monastic life in the East, as in the West, has been carefully legislated for in detail by the canons of various general and local councils, and these canons have been explained and amplified by the regulations of the greater and model monasteries, especially those on Mount Athos. The rules of these model monasteries are known in the East as the canons of St. Basil, and all monks in Greek countries are regarded as being "Basilian." But these careful rules now exist for the Megaspelæote, as for other Greek monastic communities, rather in theory than in daily application. Perhaps the only regulations which they never violate are those concerning fasting. And this is to us the more remarkable, as the fasts in the Greek Church are exceedingly severe. The monks, like a good portion of other Greek Christians, observe four separate lents every year, namely, the regular quadregesima which they keep in common with the Catholics, a lent of two weeks before the feast of the Twelve Apostles, June 30, another of two weeks before the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin in August, and one of four weeks during the Advent of Christmas. These are all lents of severe abstinence rather than of fast. Besides the monks never fail to abstain similarly on all the remaining Wednesdays and Fridays of the year, avoiding all use of meat, fish, eggs, butter, cheese and oil.

The management of the community has at its head the Hegoumenos, or Abbot. Among all the abbots of the monasteries of Greece he of Mega Spelæon ranks first. He is a mitred abbot and has the privilege of carrying a crosier and of wearing robes similar to those of a bishop. He is elected for a period of five years, the monks of the monastery being the electors. Their choice, however, must be confirmed by the Holy Synod at Athens. Only such monks as have lived for six years in the monastery can have a vote

in this election. The privilege of electing the abbot is conceded not only to Mega Spelæon, but to all monasteries where the number of monks is more than six. Where there are not six monks the abbot is appointed directly by the Synod at Athens.

In the management of affairs the abbot is assisted by two counsellors, who with the abbot constitute a body called the "hegoumeno-symboulion." In case this body fail to arrive at a decision in regard to important matters, they call to their assistance such of the monks as have been previously abbots, and others who belong to the category of "gerontoteroi." The ex-abbots are usually two or three in number, and are known as "prohegoumenoi." The gerontoteroi are the aged monks that have spent a long and edifying life in the monastery. And if this larger body cannot settle the difficulties, then another class of monks called the "Senators" is summoned to take part in the deliberations. The Senators are monks of good standing who have arrived at the age of forty-five. Whatever be the decision of this congress consisting of abbot, counsellors, ex-abbots, gerontoteroi and senators, it is final. There is no higher authority in the monastery.

The monastery possesses quite a valuable library. It contains about twenty manuscripts of the Gospels. Of these the oldest one is written on parchment and dates from the eleventh century. The others are not so old. There are also specimens of rare editions of the classics and old editions of the fathers. These books and manuscripts are chiefly gifts. How interesting so ever they be to the bibliophile or to the palæographer or antiquarian, they have but little value, comparatively, as books for an ordinary library and for daily use. This fact is immediately evident to any one who visits the library, in spite of the repeated assertion of the librarian that the monks are very fond of reading. The monastery buys no new books as a rule. Individual monks may in this matter, as in others, follow their own inclination. The printed books in the library are mostly ecclesiastical and theological. Besides serving as a library, this room is a general cabinet of historical relics and curiosities. There are mitres of mediæval bishops, crosiers, jeweled crosses, relics of saints, rich old vestments, vellum manuscripts, patriarchal bulls, in profusion and confusion.

In general it may be said that just as real holiness is not much in vogue amongst the monks, so also is deep learning a lost art. A number of novices from Mega Spelæon have been sent to the higher schools to study; and at present there may be counted at least a score of Megaspelæotes who have taken a course in theology or philology. Nearly all of these have studied in the University of Athens, a few of them in Germany. But after completing their

studies, if they receive no appointment calling them to labor as priests in some foreign mission, or as teachers or professors in some schools, they quickly forget their scientific habits and lose their inclination to study. Mega Spelæon, however, has good men engaged in professional duties outside of the monastery. There are in the United States two Megaspelæote priests laboring among the Greek emigrants. Several of the bishops of Greece are from Mega Spelæon, including the Metropolitan of Athens, the head of the Hellenic Church.

The monastery has always been a popular shrine for pilgrims. They come so frequently and regularly that the monastery provides a special "xenon" or hotel for them. No visitor is excluded from the hospitality of the monastery. These pilgrims go there to light a candle before the image of the Madonna, or to perform some other religious act, or have a Mass said, or make a confession and receive Holy Communion. Many come in consequence of a vow, having promised that if certain hopes of theirs be fulfilled, they would make a pilgrimage to the monastery. One can often see such people, especially peasants and women, performing these pilgrimages barefooted, through a desire to do penance.

But also a number of persons go to Mega Spelæon simply to enjoy a pleasant outing. There are two "xenons," one for the poorer and the other for the richer visitors. Those that have relations or friends among the monks, especially if they be friends of the abbot, are taken to private rooms and entertained elaborately. All visitors must arrive before sunset, as at that time the outer gates are barred, and it would be difficult to get near enough to persuade the man in authority to open them. Likewise all weapons must be left with the watchman at the entrance gate. This is a relic of the days of Turkish sway.

In Turkish times the monastery, on account of the protection which its sacredness afforded to the "rajahs," was regarded as a proper place for the Christians to meet once every year and hold a kind of fair, each visitor bringing whatever he had to sell and purchasing such objects as he had need of. Little merchants from afar came and exposed their wares and trinkets. But after the wars of liberation were over this practice was discontinued and the fair was transferred to the neighboring town of Kalabryta, where it is still held annually, at the same time of the year, the week preceding the feast of the Assumption, in August. At Mega Spelæon, however, the name still remains attached to a hill in front of the monastery, called "the hill of the fair;" and on its top is a chapel called the "Madonna of the fair" or the "Panegyristria."

The monks of Mega Spelæon on account of the manner in which

they are recruited are from amongst the people of the neighboring provinces of Achaia, Arkadia and Korinthia. Being children of the people, they have always sympathized with the struggles of the people, and this at times when it was a sacrifice to do so. When in the year 1819 the Philike Hetæria, which had been organized in Odessa in 1814, and whose object was the liberation of the Christians of the East from Moslem rule, began to be more freely propagated in the Peloponnesos, Hierotheos, the abbot of Mega Spelæon, together with three other monks, were among the noted Peloponnesians that joined the society. And after the patriotic convention of the leading Christians at Ægion, five hours distant from the monastery, this Philotheos, being regarded as one of the most reliable and patriotic priests of the Greeks, was commissioned to travel through the Peloponnesos and communicate with the other rajahs and prepare them for the approaching strife by giving advice and collecting funds.

On account of its impregnable position the monastery was a frequent place of refuge for many during the awful wars of annihilation from 1821 to 1828. In 1821, at the outbreak of the struggle, when the Christians massacred the unfortunate Turks of Langadia, Kannellos Delegiannes, one of the most prominent Christians of that town, hurried his wife and children off to Mega Spelæon, in order that he might feel more at ease in fighting for his country. Likewise the family of the old hero Zaimes took refuge here more than once.

In spite of the benefits conferred on the cause of the Christians by the monastery and monks, it escaped all serious damage from the Turks. Only in the last year of the war, in 1827, was it threatened with impending destruction; but the danger was averted. The Sultan of Turkey failing of being able either to suppress or annihilate the Christians, after six years of fire and sword and assassination, called to his aid the bloody Ibraim Pasha of Egypt, offering him the country in fief if he could subdue it. Ibraim came with an army of Arabs and destroyed every thing in his way. In July of 1827 he came to Kalabryta, three hours away from the monastery. He was full of triumph, for he had captured and destroyed the immortal town of Mesolonghi, had ravaged and burned most of the Peloponnesos and had made many of the rajahs kiss his hand in submission. He brought an army of fifteen thousand men against the monastery. But Kolokotrones had by his wonderful skill succeeded in sending a band of his palikars there, who, uniting their strength to that of the monks, formed a defending body of about six hundred men. They dragged two or three old cannon to the top of the rock above the monastery, located them in the fort there and prepared to resist.

Ibraim to save himself the trip to the monastery sent three successive letters calling their attention to his proximity, to his large army and his artillery, and advising them to surrender and acknowledge his authority. According to a copy preserved in the monastery, the answer of the monks was as follows:

"Most high ruler of the army of the Othmans, hail. We have received your note, and we are aware of what you mention. We know that you are as near as the fields of Kalabryta, and that you have all the means of war. But for us to submit to you cannot be done, because we are under oath by our Faith either to get free or to die in war; and according to our belief it is not right to break our holy oath to our Country. We advise you to go and fight somewhere else. Because if you come here and conquer us the misfortune will not be very great, as you will merely rout some priests. But if you get licked, as we surely expect with the help of God, because we have a good position, it will be a shame to you, and then the Greeks will take heart and will hunt you down from all sides. This is our advice; you look to your interests like a knowing man. We have a letter from the Boulé and from General Kolokotrones that he will under all circumstances send us palikars and food, and we will soon all be free men or will die true to our holy oath of Country.

"Damaskenos the abbot, and the priests and monks with me. June 21, 1827."

Kolokotrones' aid-de-camp Chrysanthopoulos commanded the monks and pilakars that defended the monastery. For two days did Ibraim rage against it with infantry and artillery and cavalry. But he had to withdraw, concluding that the monastery was impregnable by its position and its defenders. He went back to Arkadia to continue his devastations elsewhere. Two months later his ships were sunk in the harbor of Navarino by the united fleets of Europe, and the Greeks were free.

Otho loved the monks of Mega Spelæon. Twelve of them did he especially honor, and with his own hand pinned the medals for bravery on their breasts. The room is still shown at Mega Spelæon where he slept. And the monks still love to tell of how he hugged some of the old heroes that had fought in the war of liberation; for many of the older monks still remember the great-hearted Catholic King, Otho the Bavarian.

DANIEL QUINN.

Kalabryta, Greece.

THE RISE AND FALL OF EVOLUTION BY MEANS OF NATURAL SELECTION.

IN this year of grace 1900 there has come from the press of D. Appleton & Co. the second volume of the "Revised and Enlarged Edition" of "The Principles of Biology," by Mr. Herbert Spencer. The first volume of this edition was published in 1898, and both together may be regarded as the last word, or, at least, the latest on the subject of evolution. They have the advantage, too, of coming from the highest living authority on the subject. Professor Haeckel is, indeed, still with us. His theory of evolution, too, like that of Mr. Spencer, did not confine the famous hypothesis to merely biological phenomena, but extended it to the inorganic world as well. As Professor Haeckel's enthusiasm, however, could never be made amenable to reason, and as his sanguine temperament too often led him to mistake imagination for reason and fiction for fact, his authority on the new doctrine never carried as much weight as that of Mr. Spencer. It is true that neither Professor Haeckel nor Mr. Spencer has contributed as much to the spread of the new doctrine as did the late Charles Darwin and Professor Huxley, but both Charles Darwin and Professor Huxley have already passed away, and many things have come to light even in the brief space since their exit. Mr. Spencer's volumes are the outcome of the newer light, the fuller experience, the more sober second thought, and while he still clings to a theory of evolution in some form or other, he deals some deadly blows against the Darwinian hypothesis from which it is impossible for it to recover. Unconsciously, too, and even somewhat naïvely he lays bare the weakness of evolution in any form yet advocated.

Mr. Spencer's confessions of the failure of evolution in the very form of which he himself was at one time so ardent an advocate naturally calls to mind the famous conflict, so called, of science and religion in this particular field. The last half century has been lighted up with the weird and lurid glare of the strange doctrine. The men of science, as they loftily styled themselves, strove to superinduce a reign of terror in the religious world under cover of the new theory. The overwhelming destruction of revealed religion was, we were told, inevitable. The Church was patiently awaiting her impending doom. Onlookers held their breath as they gazed on the swelling portents. Mediators and reconcilers were busy proffering their kind offices of intervention. Even the late Professor Mivart once threw himself into the breach to effect a reconciliation. But the case seemed hopeless. Religion was doomed—

and doomed not so much on account of its own inherent weakness as because of the irresistible strength of the opposing science. And now that the closing year of the century has come, it is somewhat amusing to find that once more it is not religion but science that confesses its weakness. In the light of Mr. Spencer's recent volumes it is interesting to review the history of the late movement of the doctrine of evolution.

The history of speculative science for the last half century has been, as we have said, one of noisy and aggressive boasting. Not content within its own sphere it invaded the provinces of religion. The strong were surprised; the timid were alarmed; the weaklings were in terror. Even in some who should be pillars of strength a visible slackening of courage might be noticed. Fresh crops of reconcilers sprang up from time to time, with the laudable aim of effecting a compromise that might be honorable to religion. The fathers of the Church were ransacked. The Scriptures were again read over with a watchful eye to their elasticity. New meanings were discovered for old texts, and doubtful readings were carefully adapted to the new movement. Meanwhile on came the mighty movement, ominous and terrible, threatening to overwhelm revealed religion with death and destruction. Agnosticism and destructive criticism were enlisted for the attack; but they were mere auxiliaries. The great central power—alike death-bearing and indomitable—was the doctrine of Darwinism or evolution by means of natural selection. This was the wonder of the age, the marvel of the nineteenth century, the crowning glory of science, compared with which the practical and industrial sciences, such as steam and electricity, were spoken of by speculative scientists in the language of measured scorn. "They were merely utilitarian." For fully a quarter of a century the new doctrine loomed up in gigantic proportions in the scientific world. It was the fetish of speculative science. It will be instructive to note briefly the suddenness of its rise and the greatness of its fall.

Should any one be inclined to regard such a task as superfluous, it is merely necessary to refer them to our current literature, from which it can be speedily learned that, at least in some quarters, faith in natural selection seems to be gaining ground in inverse ratio to its failure. In view of the glowing eulogies on Darwinism one reads nowadays, of the eloquent tributes to natural selection from living and deceased litterateurs, of the brilliant attempts to reconcile the Genesiatic cosmogony—even to man's origin—with the origin of species by means of natural selection, and in view of the further fact that a profession of faith in natural selection is supposed to carry with it the strongest evidence of modernity, it is a somewhat per-

ilious undertaking to go counter to the popular current in favor of Darwinism. It is, however, just twenty years since the late Professor Huxley, celebrating what he called "The Coming of Age of the Origin of Species," gave this wholesome admonition:

"History warns us that it is the customary fate of new truths to begin as heresies and to *end as superstitions* (italics ours), and as matters now stand, it is hardly rash to anticipate that in another twenty years the new generation, educated under the influences of the present day, will be in danger of accepting the main doctrines of the 'Origin of Species' *with as little reflection, and it may be with as little justification*, as so many of our contemporaries, twenty years ago, rejected them."

Twenty years have proved Professor Huxley to be a true prophet. The new generation is accepting the main doctrines of the "Origin of Species" with just "as little reflection" and just "as little justification" as Professor Huxley foretold they would; for, assuredly, if scepticism regarding natural selection has yielded to credulity, it is not owing to weight of evidence.

The notion of evolution had been floating about the world in one form or other from ancient times. It was, however, only towards the close of the last century, when the theory was propounded by Treviranus and Lamarck, that it began to seriously challenge the attention of scientists. Lamarck was a keen observer, and noticing that in the animal world organs became more fully developed by use and atrophied by disuse, he maintained that these characteristics of more fully developed or atrophied organs were transmissible to posterity. To this inheritance of organisms affected by use or disuse Lamarck attributed the variations from original types. In other words, the inheritance of organs modified by use or disuse held about the same place in Lamarck's theory of evolution that natural selection holds in the Darwinian hypothesis. "Floods of easy ridicule," as Professor Huxley tells us, "were poured" on Lamarck's theory; and though adopted by Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of the famous Charles, the doctrine of evolution dropped out of sight in the early part of the present century, drowned in the floods of ridicule poured on it by the scientists themselves. Little was heard of evolution for the next half century, until in 1859 "The Origin of Species" by means of natural selection strode into the arena, like Minerva full-armed from the brain of Jupiter. Science at once discovered in the new visitor the form and features of a god. It knelt down and worshiped. Mr. Wallace, the joint parent with Mr. Darwin of the prodigy, was, it is true, slightly overlooked in the distribution of honors, but Mr. Darwin received his full meed. The Darwinian hypothesis, as all the world now knows, was, to state the

matter roughly, simply this: All species have been developed by variation from common stocks by means of the process of natural selection. This process is closely allied to artificial selection or what is commonly called selective breeding, the struggle for existence doing for natural selection what the human agency does for selective breeding.

The new doctrine was hailed with acclamations of joy from every quarter of the scientific world. Professor Huxley, as he himself tells us, acted in the capacity of "under-nurse" to the infant prodigy. Mr. Herbert Spencer hastened to offer his kind offices, and as the cognomen of "natural selection" was somewhat "caviare to the general," he suggested a substitute for it in "the survival of the fittest." Evolution filled not only the world of science, but all the rest of the world besides. Evolution was in the air. Its success was a foregone conclusion. It was to take its place alongside the great discoveries in physical science, greater than any of them, greater than all of them, greater than the heliocentric discovery, greater than the law of gravitation, while the names of Copernicus and Newton were to rank a degree lower than that of Charles Darwin. For more than a quarter of a century evolution with natural selection as its prime minister reigned supreme. Now it begins to lie like an incubus on all physical science, for, according to the very highest scientific authority, the evidence for natural selection has completely broken down.

To those who followed the divagations of natural selection for the last quarter of a century the doctrine of Darwinism had, about the middle of the last decade, ceased to be interesting, for the reason that it had ceased to be tenable. Just then there was a general commotion in the scientific world. Dogmatism suddenly ceased. An abandonment of position followed. Darwin himself had passed away. Professor Huxley was still living. Suddenly the world beheld the singular spectacle of the two foremost men of science, Mr. Herbert Spencer and the late Professor Huxley, abandoning for the moment the field of speculation and inquiry for the humiliating work of reparation and retraction. And what is more, to all appearances, both these renowned scientists entered upon this work after due deliberation and by concerted action. Repentance does not come easily to such spirits as Professor Huxley. He had too long indulged in his favorite pastime of intimidating religion to take easily to recantation. Indeed, Professor Huxley on the stool of repentance would rob the most picturesque character in the history of modern science of all its romance. Abject penitence was hardly to be expected of him. Nevertheless, while the proud, baffled spirit fought fiercely to the last, and the note of defiance would break out

occasionally, even to the end, he was too great a lover of science to permit his name to go down to history as the supporter of a theory which he knew to be inconclusive, without sounding a note of warning to his followers. It is true that only once or twice does he speak in trumpet tones of unmistakable clearness on Darwinism itself; and that it is only when Mr. Herbert Spencer interprets for us the very strongest of them we apprehend its full significance; but his warnings to his disciples are plain, unmistakable and numerous.

With Mr. Herbert Spencer the case is entirely different. His retraction is made *ex professo*. As the Duke of Argyll put it at the time: "He goes himself into the confessional." He points out where his own theory of evolution as well as that of Mr. Darwin is defective, and for both he tries as best he can to substitute something more satisfactory. Whether he has succeeded in this is not the question here. The important point—which seems, however, to be universally overlooked—indeed, the only point worth considering, is the candid avowal that evolution by means of natural selection has been a failure. In the scramble to discover substitutes for the Darwinian hypothesis the utter failure of that hypothesis seems to be completely lost sight of. Natural selection is, in some quarters, talked of as glibly and as confidently as if it had triumphantly accomplished all it had promised. He would be a bold man who would say aught against it or against evolution; and that Mr. Herbert Spencer and the late Professor Huxley were reactionists from the famous theory needs conclusive proof. Fortunately the proof is easily furnished.

We have said that Professor Huxley was a reactionist from Darwinism, and this is true; but it is only half the truth. It sounds like the wildest of paradoxes to say that Professor Huxley was never a believer in the Darwinian hypothesis at all. Nevertheless it is but the simple truth. He was the coryphæus of the movement. He was its most eloquent and zealous advocate. In season and out of season he preached the doctrine. To him more than to any one else—more than to Mr. Spencer, more than to Professor Haeckel, more, even, than to Mr. Darwin himself—is due the wide popularity of the Darwinian hypothesis; and yet he never made a profession of faith in it to the end. Like some worshipers who are regular attendants at church services in one or other of the Protestant denominations all their lives long, but who never "join the church," subscribe to its doctrine, adopt its creed, or make a profession of faith in its tenets, Professor Huxley to the end was outside the Darwinian fold. He saw too clearly the shortcomings of natural selection from the very outset, and was, from the start, one of its keenest and most dangerous critics. Here are the facts:

The first edition of the "Origin of Species" appeared on November 24, 1859, and in the April of 1860 Professor Huxley contributed his first criticism of the work to the *Westminster Review*, in which he said:

"There is no fault to be found with Mr. Darwin's method, then; but it is another question whether he has fulfilled all the conditions imposed by that method. Is it satisfactorily proved, in fact, that species may be originated by selection? that there is such a thing as selection? that none of the phenomena exhibited by species are inconsistent with the origin of species in this way? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, Mr. Darwin's view steps out of the rank of hypotheses into those of proved theories; *but so long as the evidence (italics ours)¹ at present adduced falls short of enforcing affirmation, so long, to our minds, must the new doctrine be content to remain among the former—an extremely valuable, and in the highest degree probable, doctrine, indeed the only extant hypothesis which is worth anything in a scientific point of view; but still a hypothesis, and not yet the theory of species.*"

This was Professor Huxley's first criticism on natural selection, written a few months after the publication of Mr. Darwin's famous work. In the same article Professor Huxley added:

"After much consideration, and with assuredly no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is our clear conviction that, *as the evidence now stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characters exhibited by species in Nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural.*"

Again, closing his objection drawn from the sterility of hybrids, he thus concludes:

"But still, as the case stands at present, this 'little rift within the lute' *is not to be disguised or overlooked.*"

And before closing his article he says:

"We have ventured to point out that it ('The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection') *does not, as yet, satisfy all those requirements.*" (The requirements of "scientific logic.")

Professor Huxley has, we think, left little room for doubt regarding the meaning of the foregoing extracts. They establish his position with regard to natural selection clearly. He had evidently the hope that one day the hypothesis might prove a demonstrated theory, but until that time, if a bull may be permitted, scepticism was his creed. It may, possibly, be urged that Professor Huxley changed his views as years went on, and that his scepticism was dispelled by the proofs which the next quarter of a century brought to light. He himself can best answer this question also. A short

¹ Italics throughout this article are ours, unless indicated otherwise.

time before his death, in controversy with the Duke of Argyll, defending himself against the charge of being a reactionist in evolution, he took occasion to reiterate his faith, such as it was, in Darwinism, in connection with which he used those remarkable words:

"It is only a few weeks since I happened to read over again the first articles I ever wrote (now twenty-seven years ago) on the '*Origin of Species*,' and I found nothing that I wished to modify in the opinions that are there expressed, though subsequent vast accumulation of evidence in favor of Mr. Darwin's views would give me much to add."

We have just seen what those views were in which, after twenty-seven years, he "found nothing to modify." During all that time an army of scientific inquirers had been industriously at work with natural selection as their watchword and evolution as their goal. The activity of the scientific world during these twenty-seven years is unparalleled in the history of science. Willing workers and anxious seekers in every department of speculative science—in natural history, in geology, in palæontology, in biology, in physiology, in morphology, in comparative anatomy, in the newer sciences of anthropology, embryology and synthetic chemistry—had but one end in view, one Eureka as their object, namely, the lifting of evolution by means of natural selection out of the rank of hypotheses and placing it securely in that of demonstrated theories; and yet at the close of that time Professor Huxley frankly admitted to the world that he had "nothing to modify" in an article in which he had deliberately consigned to the rank of mere "hypotheses" Darwin's doctrine of the evolution of species, in which he had openly declared that this doctrine had "not yet satisfied all the requirements of scientific logic," and in which he pointed out "the little rift within the lute" that was soon to make the music of that doctrine mute.

Strange as it may seem, then, there is no doubt that Professor Huxley never regarded the evolution of species as propounded by Mr. Darwin as a scientific truth at all. But, it may be asked, this being the case, why was he so strenuous an advocate of Darwinism, and why should there be need of reparation on his part? The same answer will suffice for both these questions. While he regarded it as of little value, inasmuch as it was merely an unproved hypothesis, he regarded it as of the utmost value as a provisional hypothesis, or, as he himself put it, "as an instrument of investigation." It might have no truth in it. It might never become a demonstrated theory; but as an incentive to inquiry, as a stimulus to research, as a guide in observation and experiment—in a word, as a good working hypothesis—he regarded it as unequalled. He did not hesitate to assert

that it was far "superior to any preceding or contemporary hypothesis in the extent of observational and experimental basis on which it rests, in its rigorously scientific method and in its power of explaining biological phenomena." This was its value, or at least a portion of its value, in his estimation. A further value he thus explains:

"We should leave a very wrong impression on the reader's mind if we permitted him to suppose that the value of the work depends wholly on the ultimate justification of the theoretical views which it contains. On the contrary, if they were disproved to-morrow, the book would still be the best of its kind—the most compendious statement of well-sifted facts bearing on the doctrine of species that has ever appeared."

These were the qualities in the new doctrine which elicited his regard and enlisted his enthusiasm. This enthusiasm, indeed, he carried beyond all due limits. He expressed himself in such terms that his hearers and his readers were not to blame if they looked upon him as a firm believer in the truth of the doctrine itself. The disciples, taking the cue from the master, whose meaning they misunderstood, soon began to out-Herod Herod, until at last Mr. Spencer was forced to complain that "nowadays most naturalists are more Darwinian than Darwin himself." Professor Huxley's eyes were at last opened to the real situation, and hence the work of reparation and admonition. We shall quote two or three instances of Professor Huxley's penitential texts. In his history of "The Advance of Science Within the Last Half Century," referring to some of the advanced views in anthropology, he finds room for these pregnant words:

"Much of the speculative 'phylogeny' which abounds among my present contemporaries reminds me forcibly of the speculative morphology, unchecked by a knowledge of development, which was rife in my youth. As hypothesis, suggesting inquiry in this or that direction, it is often extremely useful; but, when the product of such speculation is placed on a level with those generalizations of morphological truths which are represented by the definitions of natural groups, it tends to confuse fancy with fact, and to create mere confusion. We are in danger of drifting into a new 'Natur-Philosophie' worse than the old. Boyle did great service to science by his 'Sceptical Chemist,' and I am inclined to think that, at the present day, a 'Sceptical Biologist' might exert an equally beneficent influence."

Sceptical biologist indeed! But who, in these days of ultra-Darwinism, will tolerate a sceptical biologist? Nevertheless, it is well to remember that we have the salutary warning of the foremost biologist of his time against overmuch faith in the new anthropology.

Again, in one of his articles on "Science and Pseudo-science," Professor Huxley says :

"As is the case with all new doctrines, so with that of evolution : the enthusiasm of advocates has sometimes tended to degenerate into fanaticism, and mere speculation has at times threatened to shoot beyond its legitimate bounds. I have occasionally thought it wise to warn the more adventurous spirits among us against these dangers in sufficiently plain language."

All of which unmistakably indicates "a change of heart" in Professor Huxley's later years from the days when he, too, was among the more adventurous spirits who seemed to think that speculation could not be carried too far and that its only legitimate boundary lines were the imagination. We shall let Mr. Herbert Spencer add one more of Professor Huxley's admonitions, perhaps the most significant of all of them. In his epilogue to "The Factors of Organic Evolution," Mr. Spencer thus quotes Professor Huxley :

"With these passages I may fitly join a remark made in the admirable address Professor Huxley delivered before unveiling the statue of Mr. Darwin in the museum at South Kensington. *Deprecating the supposition that an authoritative sanction was given by the ceremony to the current ideas concerning evolution, he said that 'science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.'*"

If language means anything, then Darwinism had, after a quarter of a century of trial, fallen into utter disrepute. The feet of the idol were found to be of clay after all. Dagon had fallen prone from the altar on which science had, a quarter of a century previous, so proudly placed him. Scientific men shrank from even the appearance of lending the dethroned idol their sanction or approval, and the consequence of their having been duped by the impostor was the utterance of the conviction that scientific creeds are dangerous things for men of science ; which, put epigrammatically so as never to be forgotten, is "*science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.*" This was the bitter lesson taught Professor Huxley by meddling with the doctrine of the origin of species by natural selection. The full significance of this revolt will be understood when we remember that it is the same Professor Huxley who was once so enthusiastic an advocate of the new doctrine, who acted in the capacity, as he himself tells us, of "under-nurse" to the theory, who was the orator when it celebrated its coming of age, who was the chosen expounder of the doctrine on all public occasions, and who, even now, when a statue was being unveiled in honor of Mr. Darwin, was the orator by natural selection on the occasion ; that it is the same Professor Huxley who now makes use of that occasion to stab the doctrine to the heart, and who goes even to the length of "deprecating the sup-

position that an authoritative sanction was given by the ceremony" to the doctrine of evolution by means of natural selection. Well might natural selection cry out "*Et tu Brute.*"

It would be easy to adduce other proofs of Professor Huxley's attitude towards the doctrine; but we think enough has been said to show that we have not overstated the case when we said that Professor Huxley never made a profession of faith in the doctrine of natural selection at all, and that towards the close of his life he was engaged in the work of reparation by uttering warnings and admonitions to his followers. With Professor Huxley there was, as has been said, no occasion for retraction. He had never made an act of faith in the doctrine.

With Mr. Herbert Spencer the case was different. Not only had he openly avowed his faith in the efficacy of evolution as taught by Mr. Darwin, but he had even disputed with Mr. Darwin the honor of inventing it. Moreover, Mr. Darwin did not extend his generalization beyond the domain of biology, while Mr. Spencer not only extended it to the inorganic world, but endeavored to apply it to all psychical, social and political phenomena as well. For Mr. Darwin's "natural selection" he invented the Spencerian equivalent, "the survival of the fittest," and around this as a centre as many battles were waged as over the famous Darwinian phrase itself. Mr. Spencer's advocacy of evolution was not as enthusiastic as Professor Huxley's, but it was more positive and assertive; hence the need of retraction in his case. And it must be admitted that the recantation is clear, candid and ample.

In the year 1886 Mr. Spencer contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* two articles which could not fail to be epoch-making in the history of natural selection. They were entitled "The Factors of Organic Evolution." Whatever indirection there might have been in the method of announcement, the announcement itself was unmistakable. It was the confession that the dogmatism of a quarter of a century had been a mistake. "Natural selection" and "the survival of the fittest" were both inadequate to account for the origin of species. Mr. Spencer does not, like Professor Huxley, content himself with laying down a general principle or uttering oracular epigram. He at once plunges *in medias res*. He comes at once to particulars. He puts the question plainly, even bluntly: Has "natural selection" succeeded? In the very first sentence of his first article he makes a clean breast of the whole matter. The article opens thus:

"While recognizing in full the process brought into clear view by Mr. Darwin, and traced out by him with so much care and skill, *we may fitly ask whether those are right who conclude that, taken alone, it*

accounts for organic evolution? Has the natural selection of favorable variations been the sole factor, as it is now commonly supposed to have been?"

And his answer comes promptly:

"On critically examining the evidence, we shall find reason to think that *it by no means explains all that has to be explained.*"

Mr. Spencer immediately adds what he believes must be regarded as a necessary supplemental factor:

"Unless that increase of a part resulting from extra activity and that decrease of it resulting from inactivity are transmissible to descendants, *we are without a key to many phenomena of organic evolution.*"

To those who had pinned their faith to Darwin and Spencer and who had long regarded, on the authority of these scientists, evolution as the solution of all biological and even of all cosmical problems, this announcement came like a thunder-clap from a serene sky. What did it mean? That natural selection and the survival of the fittest had been failures? Of a surety this and nothing else. Mr. Spencer asks the question plainly: Does "natural selection" account for organic evolution? And he answers without hesitation that, on critical examination, "it by no means explains all that has to be explained;" that it leaves us "without a key to many phenomena of organic evolution." Nay, what is more, recognizing this utter failure of "natural selection" to "explain all that has to be explained," he at once casts about for some other means of explanation; and, strange to say, of all others, he selects as a worthy coadjutor of natural selection the effete hypothesis of Lamarck, which, as we have seen, was, about the beginning of the century, rejected by the scientists with scorn and drowned in floods of ridicule. This obsolete doctrine he rakes up from the rubbish of a past age, tries to galvanize it into new life and places it as the head of the corner. He tells us in cold print that while "the hypothesis of the inheritance of functionally produced modifications" (the Lamarck theory) is "utterly inadequate to explain the major part of the facts, . . . yet there is a minor part of the facts, *very extensive though less, which must be ascribed to this cause.*" He then proceeds to describe three classes of difficulties which cannot be explained by natural selection, but "which disappear if the inherited effects of use and disuse are recognized."

Whether Mr. Spencer makes good his contention regarding the solution of those different classes of difficulties by the rehabilitated factor does not come within the scope of this article. All that is necessary here is merely to recognize the fact—too often lost sight of—that Mr. Spencer has recorded in the strongest way his loss of

Vol. XXVI.—Sig. 7.

faith in natural selection and the survival of the fittest as a solution of the problem of evolution. This is all the more remarkable, too, coming from Mr. Spencer at a time of life when, as he himself once said about Mr. Darwin, "the natural tendency is towards fixity of opinion;" and coming from Mr. Spencer, of all others, for whom the failure of evolution is equivalent to drawing the pencil of cancelation throughout the pages of his colossal life work. But this is not all. Mr. Spencer, having entered on the work of demolition, pursues it unrelentingly to the end. He has shown the failure of the Darwinian theory of natural selection "to explain all that has to be explained," and he has supplemented it by the Lamarckian theory of the inherited effects of use and disuse, as a necessary auxiliary. But he does not stop here. He tells us that even both these together are inadequate to explain all the facts; that there is still need of a third. And he tells us this quite as bluntly as he told us there was need of a second. Here is how he puts the question:

"But now, supposing the broad conclusion above drawn to be granted—supposing all to agree that from the beginning, along with inheritance of useful variations fortuitously arising (the Darwinian theory), there has been inheritance of effects produced by use and disuse (the Lamarckian theory), *do there remain no classes of phenomena unaccounted for?*"

And, as before, the answer comes promptly and unhesitatingly:

"To this question I think it must be replied that *there do remain classes of organic phenomena unaccounted for*. It may, I believe, be shown that *certain cardinal traits of animals and plants at large are still unexplained.*"

Well might the devout evolutionist exclaim: "Mercy on us! What is going to happen next? Has catastrophism not only reasserted itself, but overtaken the doctrine of evolution, too?" For the world had been filled with the resounding echoes of Darwinism. It was to account for everything. It had just begun to be regarded as almighty and irrefragable. And just in the supreme moment of its exaltation the foremost living evolutionist suddenly calls a halt and declares it an ignominious failure. Nor were Mr. Spencer's reasons for his abrupt interruption of the apotheosis of Darwinism calculated to reassure the ardent evolutionists. Important and far-reaching as were Mr. Spencer's articles, they were still more significant in the spirit that prompted them. He told the world plainly that the articles were written for the express purpose of stemming the tide of credulity. What could be stronger than these words?

"Along with larger motives, one motive which has joined in promoting the foregoing articles has been the desire to point out that already among biologists *the beliefs concerning the origin of species*

have assumed too much the character of a creed. . . . There seems occasion for recognizing the warning uttered by Professor Huxley as not uncalled for."

The warning here referred to as coming from Professor Huxley was that already quoted, in which he said that "science commits suicide when it adopts a creed." And Mr. Spencer concludes his remarkable articles—perhaps the most memorable articles on the subject since Mr. Darwin's "Origin of Species" appeared forty-one years ago—with these pregnant words:

"Whatever may be thought of the arguments in this article and the preceding one, they will perhaps serve to show that *it is as yet too soon to close the inquiry concerning the causes of organic evolution.*"

We have called these articles of Mr. Spencer's a work of reparation and retraction, and we think that, as in the case of Professor Huxley, we have here, too, made good our claim. Coming as they did from the foremost of living evolutionists, they produced immediately a profound impression in the scientific world. The tide of opinion at once began to turn from the belief in natural selection as the sole cause of evolution, and scientists began to cast about for new factors to take its place, since that had proved inadequate. The revolt of Professor Huxley with that of Mr. Spencer, and, to all appearances, according to a mutual understanding, shook the doctrine of natural selection to its very centre, and the temples of the long-cherished idol were soon destitute of worshipers. Of the vast multitude that fifteen years ago bent the knee before Darwinism as the true and only deity of the scientific world, perhaps not more than two of any note—Professor Weismann and Dr. Romanes—have maintained the faith in natural selection pure and unadulterated—if, indeed, panmixia and special determinants can be conceived as non-adulterating. Some have openly repudiated the doctrine altogether and adopted the inheritance of functionally produced modifications as their creed instead. Others, still, profess a sort of divided faith, acknowledging a sort of dual divinity as supreme in the evolutionary world. This amphibious deity is part Darwinian and part Lamarckian, for it is a combination of "natural selection" and the "inheritability of functional modifications." Outside of these anarchy reigns supreme. The tendency is towards independent views. Each scientist shows an inclination to set up his own little Bethel for himself. Hence we have not only panmixia, which is, to be sure, only an offshoot of natural selection, and determinate evolution or orthogenesis as it is called; we have not only the "isolation" resulting in "monotypic evolution" and the "isolation" resulting in "polytypic evolution," besides the "physiological selection" recently elaborated by Dr. Romanes; but Mr. Spencer, himself not dismayed or dis-

heartened by the failure of the survival of the fittest, has undertaken to find new factors for evolution. He had adopted natural selection under the cognomen of survival of the fittest; but found, as we have seen, that "it by no means explains all that is to be explained." Next he supplemented natural selection by "the inheritance of functionally produced modifications," and still, again, found that there remained "many classes of organic phenomena unaccounted for." He then introduced a third factor, which he called "the direct action of the medium"—using the word medium—as including "all physical forces falling upon them (living organisms) as well as matters bathing them." But Mr. Spencer had already opened wide the flood-gates of revolution. Rebellion is now in the air. The humblest scientist refuses longer to call any man master. Regard for high authority, so long sacred and so edifyingly carried out towards Mr. Darwin and his scientific offspring, has fled the school of evolution. Lawlessness reigns supreme. Mr. Spencer sowed the dragon's teeth, and he has lived to witness and bear the dire results. And so when he tries to raise his voice above the din and confusion no one listens, or, if they do, it is but to question and argue as if with one without authority. Indeed, a special creationist—supposing a specimen of the extinct race still left upon the earth—beholding Darwinism dethroned, natural selection a mere *magni nominis umbra*, anarchy and chaos supreme in the world of evolution, might well believe that retributive justice had at last overtaken his once proud oppressor and that all the woes and tribulations of his brethren were being amply avenged.

So far we have seen Professor Huxley's revolt against the doctrine of natural selection. We have seen how Mr. Spencer first adopted the doctrine, found it insufficient, then how, instead of promptly rejecting it, he undertook to strengthen it by introducing the hypothesis of adaptive changes, as one undertakes to strengthen a flawed timber by adventitious methods. We have seen, from Mr. Spencer's own confession, how both these together, still showing structural weakness, he was obliged to buttress them by a third—the direct action of the medium. This piece of evolutionary engineering took place in 1886, fourteen years ago. It is interesting and instructive to inquire how the doctrine has fared during that period. Up to that time there was unity of faith throughout the world of evolution. The creed was one, the discipline was one, the worship was one. No one had been rash enough to question the divinity of the scientific deity, much less to dare lay sacrilegious hands upon it. But in an evil hour Mr. Spencer unveiled the prophet and laid bare its infirmities to the scientific world. Disunion and dissension naturally ensued. Evolution, following its own law of variation,

has branched out into many varieties—so many, indeed, that it would not be at all surprising to find it in its own personality cutting the gordian knot and solving the sphinx's riddle for good and all by originating a new species. It would be a profitless task to follow out the different varieties into which evolution has evolved itself. The main branch is still that advocated by Mr. Spencer. Mr. Spencer still stands without a rival in the school of evolution, and we shall follow him as still by far the ablest exponent of the doctrine. Meanwhile, however, we must not forget the fact that there is no longer a theory of natural selection ruling far and wide, arbitrarily and autocratically exclusive, as in the days before the revolt. Not even in the Neo-Darwinian school of evolution is natural selection regarded as a competent cause of evolution without support of some kind. Before examining the main branch of the doctrine held by Mr. Spencer let us inquire into the fate of natural selection within the last decade.

Since Mr. Spencer's revolt against the once famous doctrine he has been fiercely assailed and an internecine warfare has ensued. In the strife Mr. Spencer has done irreparable damage to the cause of which he was once so staunch a supporter. The cause of natural selection has received at his hands many bloody wounds—some of them even fatal. Indeed, all that is necessary in order to see how utterly natural selection has broken down is to read Mr. Spencer's portion of the controversy with the Neo-Darwinians during the last six or seven years. The enemies of natural selection need go no further than Mr. Spencer's recent writings for the most deadly weapons against the hypothesis that had once come to be looked upon as impregnable. Mr. Spencer found himself in two somewhat difficult rôles. In the first place he found himself in the awkward position of assailant and defender of natural selection at one and the same time; hence it was inevitable that he should give it some ugly stabs. Then we find that without wholly discarding natural selection he took to himself a new favorite in the inheritance of functionally produced modifications, and in the clashing claims of the two favorites the old one received at his hands scant courtesy. Hence we find him referring to natural selection as "the fashionable hypothesis." We hear his sharp retort to the Neo-Darwinians that "*they admit that there is no direct proof that any species has been established by natural selection.*" He tartly tells them that in certain cases he rejects natural selection because "*When to uncertainties in the arguments supporting the hypothesis we add its inability to explain facts of cardinal significance,*" he is compelled to do so. And he enumerates three distinct classes of problems—the coadaptation of co-operative parts, the possession of unlike powers of discrimination

by different parts of the human skin and the question of rudimentary organs—where natural selection utterly fails, and sums up by saying, "Failure to solve any one of these problems would, I think, alone prove the Neo-Darwinian doctrines untenable; and the fact that we have *three* (italics Mr. Spencer's) unsolved problems seems to me to be fatal." With this parting blow from Mr. Spencer, we think Natural Selection—once written with capitals—may safely be left in the hands of its friends as incapable of further good or evil. We can now turn to the examination of evolution in Mr. Spencer's own hands.

Mr. Spencer's new gospel of evolution is, as we have seen, a species of eclecticism. It is indeed a strange conglomerate of species grafted on species, adaptive changes grafted on natural selection and the direct action of the medium grafted on both. It is, indeed, possible that the weakness of the Darwinian hypothesis and the weakness of the Lamarckian hypothesis when put together make for strength, but it is not quite reassuring to find that this strength Mr. Spencer finds it necessary to buttress by a third hypothesis admittedly no stronger than either. In fact, there seems to be a little danger that the doctrine of evolution may prove to be something of a monstrosity, inasmuch as it seems to be developing heads as rapidly as the Lernæan hydra. For first we had at least a symmetric doctrine in natural selection, whatever else it might be wanting in. But natural selection being lopped off, two other heads instantly spring up in its place, and every new excision seems to develop another and still another. A quarter of a century ago Mr. Spencer seemed to be a firm believer that natural selection was sufficient to account for all biological phenomena. To-day he stoutly insists that not one, but three are necessary, and even shows a willingness to look with some degree of favor on still other coadjutors, such as isolation, physiological selection, etc. The question, therefore, naturally arises: how has Mr. Spencer's experiment succeeded? If in a multitude of counselors there is much wisdom, in a multiplicity of factors we might expect some solvent potency. But Mr. Spencer does not seem to be any nearer the solution of the problem evolution started out to solve than when he attempted the solution by means of natural selection alone.

The inquirer cannot fail to be struck by several strange features of Mr. Spencer's new formula of evolution. We shall briefly call attention to five, the first and last being especially striking. The first of these is its openly acknowledged failure. We ask: With all these new factors is the problem solved? Does evolution at last explain all that is to be explained? And Mr. Spencer still answers: No. He candidly, as before, says: "*But now let it be confessed there*

remain many unsolved problems." And as if to impress us with the fact still more strongly, he adds: "*Thus the process of evolution is far from being understood.*" This then is the result after forty-one years of trial with not only natural selection as a key, but with whatever else scientific ingenuity could devise by way of new hypotheses. In this year of grace, 1900, it is again confessed that with all modern appliances and after countless attempts "many problems remain unsolved," and that "the process of evolution is far from being understood."

We have said that the first and last features of Mr. Spencer's new theory of evolution are especially striking; but in some respects the second is the most striking of all. It is nothing more or less than the attempt to "ignore" the distinctions of species as mere "technical ideas" and merely "incidental phenomena." But one asks naturally: Was not this the question precisely which evolution started out to solve? the all-important question? And scientists can only reply: Yes, it was the question of questions. Indeed, in the face of the agitation of the last half century scientists cannot answer otherwise. What, then, must be thought of this latest variation of evolution? One reads a second and a third time to be sure that his senses do not deceive him. Desperate indeed must be the cause which is forced to fly to such a refuge. To solve a problem by ignoring it altogether as merely technical is indeed the newest feat in the scientific world; but what, when this is the problem on which the whole question at issue hinges, indeed when it is the problem of problems itself? As we expect to return to this question later on, we may pass to the third feature to which we wish to call attention. It is this:

The process of evolution was to be strictly scientific. Science admitted nothing in the way of explanation which did not fall within the sphere of our conceptions. Conceivability Mr. Spencer himself set up as the test of truth. Whatever did not fall within the limits of conceivability was to be rigorously excluded. This was why special creation was so summarily ejected. It introduced an inconceivable element into its account of phenomena, and this science could never abide much in the same way as Mistress Quickly tells of Falstaff that "A could never abide carnation." But now Mr. Spencer tells us quite candidly that the theory of adaptive changes which he has formally installed as a coadjutor to natural selection, and without which he tells us "an extensive part of the phenomena cannot be explained," is not conceivable in thought at all. The process, he admits, is wholly inconceivable. In plain words he says: "At last, then, we are obliged to admit that the actual organizing process transcends conception. It is not enough to say that we

cannot know it; we must say that we cannot even conceive it." Nevertheless, dispensing himself from the rigorous test he imposed on others, he introduces the theory of adaptive changes. Yet even with this explanation, which is inconceivable, and with the distinction of species—the main problem—thrown in, he tells us still that "there remain many unsolved problems." The fourth feature to which we wish to call attention is but a corollary of the third. Mr. Spencer, finding the theory of adaptive changes inconceivable, yet loath to part with it, undertakes to symbolize it, and what is even worse the symbolic conceptions of it which he undertakes to introduce belong to what he himself has long since designated as "the illegitimate order;" that is to say, they belong to that class upon which, in religion, Mr. Spencer has over and over again pronounced anathema. Now, however, fronting the difficulty of solving problems which are insoluble by conceivable processes, he takes refuge in the very method which he has so severely censured. Finding that the process of adaptive changes is inconceivable, that here "imagination, whatever license may be given, utterly fails us," he concludes: "Thus all we can do is to find some way of symbolizing the process so as to enable us most conveniently to generalize its phenomena." In other words, he adopts precisely what he condemned special creation for adopting and recalls the method which he visited with Anathema Maranatha. And yet with all this he admits "there remain many unsolved problems." But this is not all.

The fifth and last feature to which we will direct attention remains to be seen. We have seen how science started out to solve the problem offered by phenomena in general, or, if you prefer it that way, by biological phenomena in particular, by means of natural selection alone, and, according to the testimony of the evangelists of natural selection, how egregiously it has failed. We saw how it then asked to be permitted to use as an additional key to the problem the theory of adaptive changes, and how there was still failure. We saw how a third key was added with no better results; residual phenomena there remained still which yielded to no solvent. We saw how various other factors were called in to assist in the solution, with failure still as the result. We saw how, in its desperation, science then attempted to throw out the very question at issue—the origin of species—but that even still many kinds of phenomena remained unaccounted for. We saw how science did not scruple even to adopt unscientific methods and transgressed its own canons by introducing inconceivable processes where legitimate scientific methods failed; but yet with no better success. We saw how as a last resort it betook itself—like Macbeth to the weird sisters—to "symbolic conceptions of the illegitimate order," of which it had expressed so

dread an abhorrence ; and still here failure is written in glaring characters over the broad face of evolution. And now with the solution of one portion of the phenomena claimed by one hypothesis, with the solution of another extensive portion of the phenomena claimed by two antagonistic hypotheses, and with a large realm of the phenomena yet unaccounted for by any hypothesis, we are further told that the mysteries which science started out to solve by means of evolution remain with us as mysteries still. We are no better off than when we set out. We are not a single step in advance of special creation. We have mysteries as numerous and perplexing as before. Mr. Spencer tells us life is a mystery. Its origin is a mystery. There is a mystery in its functions. There is an inconceivable element in its workings. Mr. Spencer is in a quandary as to whether he can hope that the mystery will one day be solved, or whether "We must conclude that since life itself proves to be in its ultimate nature inconceivable, there is probably an inconceivable element in its workings" also. "What then are we to say—what are we to think?" Mr. Spencer asks. And he answers: "Simply that in this direction, as in all other directions, our explanations finally bring us face to face with the inexplicable. The ultimate reality behind this manifestation, as behind all other manifestations, transcends conception. It needs but to observe how even simple forms of existence are in their ultimate natures incomprehensible to see that this most complex form of existence is in a sense doubly incomprehensible."

This then is the last word of evolution. The mystery which it set out to solve remains a mystery still. The flourish of trumpets was a false alarm. The science that condemned religion because of symbol and mystery finds itself in turn forced to fall back on symbol and mystery in the last resort. But why symbol and mystery should be regarded as intolerable in religion where they are rational and logical, while they are regarded as desirable in science, where they are illogical and absurd, is one of the paradoxes which, like some biological phenomena, defy all explanation. But this may be passed over here. The matter of deepest import is that, according to the very highest authority on the question of evolution, evolution by means of natural selection has utterly failed. And as evolution by means of natural selection has been the only theory of evolution which has ever been regarded by the world at large as worth considering, it follows that there is no theory of evolution before the world that is worth a single moment's consideration. Mr. Spencer's disproof of natural selection as a competent cause of evolution threw the subject back a full century—to Lamarck's time. And the admission that the theory of adaptive changes cannot account for all the facts, and further, that natural selection and adaptive changes

taken together—even with the addition of all the new-fangled doctrines—cannot account for all the facts, leaves the doctrine of evolution in any sense utterly baseless.

Every one knows that when a man undertakes a piece of work which he does not succeed in accomplishing he has simply failed. When he undertakes to solve a problem by certain means, and after repeated attempts tells us that much is left yet which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for, we do not hesitate to pronounce his attempted solution a failure. If the method he adopted has been properly applied the failure evidently lies in the method. We do not see why scientists should be treated with greater indulgence than their fellow-men, or why their methods should be entitled to larger exemptions. The evolutionists undertook boldly to solve the problem offered by phenomena and dismissed with contempt all previous attempts at solution. They challenged the world to come and witness the solution of the puzzle. The world stood by breathless to see the miracle. Science was to solve the riddle by natural means. We were to be shown that there was no mystery, nothing supernatural at all. The scientific magician approached the work. The necromancer was evolution with natural selection as his magic wand. The whole merit, however, lay in the fact that the process was not magical or supernatural at all; it was simply natural—scientific. All the world looked on intently while the wizard performed the wondrous feat. The wizard—evolution by means of natural selection—tries; fails. It tries again; fails again. It tries repeatedly; fails repeatedly. It asks to be allowed other means; they are granted. It tries again; again fails. It requests to be allowed still other means. Again granted—again failure. Again another means is requested, and another and another. They are all permitted; failure each time. It begs to throw out the whole central problem, which is almost the entire problem. It does so; still failure. It requests permission to use means which it loudly condemned in its competitors. Granted; failure once more. Illegitimate symbolic conceptions? Can they not be permitted, just for a trial? They are introduced—failure as great as before. Realms of facts are still unaccounted for; mysteries as inscrutable as before remain. In real life the necromancer would be hissed off the stage; in science we call it success.

Indeed, the world owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Spencer for his unconscious aid in unmasking the impostor. He has thus in a measure atoned for the colossal folly of the Synthetic Philosophy. In spite of all his faults, Mr. Spencer is still the brightest intellect in the English-speaking world of speculative science, and it is something that he has lived to cancel some of his mistakes. Certainly no one has pointed out more clearly than he the utter failure of evolu-

tion by means of natural selection. The best that can be said of evolution as it stands before the world to-day is that it is but a pieced, patched, botched theory; that even so it fails to account for all the facts it undertook to explain; that it has already abandoned all hope of being able to explain them in the future, and that to the eternal disgrace of science it is forced to take refuge in symbol and mystery. For the honor of true science the more quickly it were decently buried out of sight the better. One begins to understand why so many eminent French scientists have steadfastly refused to lend countenance to the doctrine. It is not altogether, as Mr. Spencer opines, owing to the surviving influence of Cuvier. Everlasting fame is yet awaiting the scientist who can give to the world a satisfactory theory of evolution. Can it be done? Meanwhile in our schools, colleges and universities pupils are wading through the deeps and shallows of ignorance, vainly imagining they are studying science. What is glibly called science is what Professor Huxley twenty years ago called "superstition."

In view of the admissions of the scientists themselves, may it not be pertinently asked: Would not so many of our learned and distinguished Catholic professors be more profitably employed—not only from a religious, but even from a scientific standpoint—in examining the evidence for evolution than in trying to force its acceptance on the world? One longs for even a brief season of the late Dr. Brownson's vigorous and healthy thinking.

In the foregoing pages we have shown the failure of evolution by means of natural selection from the testimony of the scientists themselves. This failure can be even more conclusively demonstrated by a critical examination of the doctrine in the light of the forty-one years during which it has been before the world. This, however, will require another article.

S. FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

THE LABORER AND HIS POINT OF VIEW.

DISORDERS among laboring men and conflicts between them and their employers have become so frequent of late that no one who is interested in public welfare has remained indifferent. Those who are not parties to the issues—at least not directly—may be roughly divided into two classes: the unthinking many and the thinking few. The former class read the newspapers, perhaps the magazines; they form opinions readily, express them freely. As they think without adequate information and speak without reflection, they unintentionally mislead others and obscure the real nature of the industrial problem. The thinking few devote themselves to careful study; they recognize the reign of law and the working of complex and subtle causes in the industrial situation. They have done much to force the question to the front; to win attention from all classes of society. Laborers themselves, no doubt, deserve most credit for actually forcing the world to study conditions; but earnest students and writers have aided to a marked degree.

The situation merits attention. A great class of our population, numbering millions, is being slowly isolated; gradually acquiring a consciousness, an individuality by which they are distinguished from other classes of society. Were the isolation of a kind which bears merely on secondary phases of social life, there need be no alarm. But it is an isolation regarding the fundamentals of our national and industrial organization. Laborers now seem to constitute a real industrial class. Their interests are regarded by them as distinct from those of professional classes and antagonistic to those of the employer and the wealthy classes. Laborers have taken a position in the industrial world which clearly reveals that isolation. They are rapidly acquiring—we may say they have acquired—the characteristics of a political class. As laborers they foster a distinctive view of our institutions and political ideals; they have a peculiar view of the functions of government and of its possibilities; there is a conscious though heretofore unsuccessful effort to reduce those views to a platform and construct thereon a labor party. Laborers constitute a distinct social class. Their tastes, judgments, enjoyments, their plane of life, ambition and aspiration are peculiar to themselves. One can scarcely come in touch with laboring men without detecting evidences of this threefold isolation. Naturally, the line of demarcation in each case is wavering; it is vague between all social classes. But that there is a decided tendency in the direction indicated seems indisputable. As a great ship lies quietly in the har-

bor, surrounded by a forest of masts and vessels of all sizes and kinds, its appearance suggests repose as we note the easy grace of its restful swaying in the water. But once it is in motion seaward, it is transformed. Grace, majesty, power are revealed in every movement. The laboring class has cut anchor; it is moving, and there is power, determination, purpose in every step.

This isolation of the laboring class is a vital question for modern society. It is in apparent contradiction with our accepted social ideals, and even with their current interpretation. Yet it is the expected product of our philosophy and institutions, historically considered. Then, again, the solution of the problems implied, constitutes a vital test of our institutions, our civilization and its possibilities. The situation in the industrial world cannot be tolerated. If we meet it successfully the triumph of popular government was never before so complete, so glorious. If we fail, our institutions will have failed of their fundamental purpose and the socialist will have been a prophet with a mission. The times are indeed solemn.

Events such as those seen in recent times in Chicago, St. Louis, Idaho and the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania show that at present neither our philosophy nor our institutions nor recognized social authority is equal to the situation. Contests concerning property rights and human rights; concerning court jurisdiction and the interpretation of fundamental laws; concerning even the power of our chief executives to employ the militia, are of frequent occurrence; and experience gained in one disturbance is of no use whatever, except to those to whose complaints the disturbances are due. There are contests every day concerning similar rights and powers. But they are orderly, peaceful and constructive. The contests referred to, however, are public, marked by great bitterness and suppressed hate; they result in no triumph of law, contribute in no way to upbuild our institutions. They are merely contests of endurance—attempts to settle by force what law has failed to determine rationally. Such disturbances, known as strikes, are only incidents in the whole situation. A battle, rather a campaign, supposes organization and armies. Out beyond the local limits of a particular strike there is going on among laborers the process of class isolation and organization. Organized they are capable of self direction, aggressive action and even revolution. It is this phase of the situation which merits most attention.

The facts in the social situation of the laboring class as the laborer sees them are fairly well known to all who care to learn them. Low wages, long hours, uncertainty of work, total dependence for living upon the property owner, diversified oppression of laborers by fines, methods of payment and company stores; wives, mothers and

children competing with fathers and brothers ; limited opportunity of elevation, culture or happiness. But statements of fact never contain the whole fact. Employers look upon the situation and see little if any difficulty ; the general public looks and is scarcely more than interested ; the laborer looks, sees himself as part of the situation and he is stirred, thrilled, aroused. The most marked result of the laborer's view is the trade union. It proclaims itself as the prophet of a new gospel, the teacher of new ethical interpretations to society, of a new conception of human dignity ; for it teaches that man, and not property, should be the basis of all social organization. In this thought there is revolution, and the laborers know it.

Observing this process of class isolation and noting the history, methods and mistakes of the labor movement, one can scarcely fail to be struck by the phenomena there seen. Unselfishness abundant, yet much gross selfishness to be seen ; order, pity and conservatism by the side of cruelty and lawlessness ; quick command of reserve force, yet pathetic inability to avoid excess in action ; clear grasp of principles and astonishing blindness to the limitations of circumstance and relation to which all social principles are necessarily subject.

It seems to be worth while to study the situation from the laborer's point of view ; to attempt to see with his eyes, hear with his ears, judge with his mind. It may aid us in dealing with him to find out what are his standards, his ideals, his views. This essay is an attempt to accomplish that purpose. *The study may be made independently of the truth or falsehood of the laborer's assumptions.* We must aim to know what are his feelings or convictions without testing the premises or examining the validity of the process by which his view has been established. The task is not easy. The sources from which the information must be drawn are of varying value. It is difficult to determine whether or not a labor leader actually represents the views of the laborers at large ; it is not easy to say how far the labor press reflects opinions and views accurately or how far it influences laboring men in the formation of their views. It is impossible to determine how far the sweeping preamble to the constitution of a labor union, voted unanimously, does contain the settled sentiment of a mass of men rather than the expression of momentary enthusiasm. Yet it is to the labor leader, the labor press, the labor convention that we must go for much information.¹ A census of individual laboring men, with generalizations based thereon, would not prove more reliable or free from error. As a rule a man is not fully conscious of his real mental attitude. How much unconscious

¹ Reports of legislative committees and of Bureaus of Labor are also useful in a study like this.

feeling or force there may be given in a deliberate process we know only when we are tested. This is shown by our general lack of control in enthusiasm or dejection. When a laborer is consciously half socialist, *e. g.*, a crisis may provoke latent feeling or energy and he will talk or act fully a socialist. On the other hand, a crisis might cause him to appear as a conservative, his half socialism not standing the test. Yet if we ask him his views they will correspond to neither course of action. The labor movement may in a way be compared to the half socialist who when tested acts and speaks fully a socialist. Not that I yet call the movement socialistic. In a crisis such as a strike, general or local, when laborers have a serious grievance, when feelings are aroused for any reason whatsoever, we find invariably that certain views come to general expression. They are uniformly extreme views, but I believe them to be a power and a prophecy; a power in furnishing the basis of protest, organization and immediate action; a prophecy because the view which to-day is extreme and rare may to-morrow be widely shared; the view which requires a crisis to call it to expression now, may to-morrow be the ordinary view of the mass. Such being the case, it seems best to expose the extreme view first, then to indicate modifications which appear. The discriminating reader will be able to understand why the exposition is suggestive rather than exhaustive; he will understand, too, that when it is stated that a given element is found in the laborer's view, the statement implies that the laborer or many laborers actually share that view, or are rapidly gravitating toward it. The exposition cannot be more accurate than its sources.

For three generations our laboring men have been taught that government exists for all the governed; that sovereignty resides in the people; that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Gifted only with a natural logic, the laborer is inclined at times to take these guarantees literally, positively, in a sense possibly which was not consciously intended by the writers of the Declaration of Independence. Were conditions uniformly prosperous there might be no complaint. But there is widespread discontent; the laborer compares the achievements of government with its professed purpose, and he concludes that as regards him government is a failure. The right to life, he feels, is not adequately protected. Courts, laws of evidence, jury, procedure, etc., are cleverly devised to protect the citizen against possible murder or assault, but there is neither court nor jury nor procedure to protect a laborer against society when its in-

stitutions force him to starve. It is nowhere written in our books of law that a man shall be guaranteed the opportunity to earn a dignified livelihood in a becoming manner. Life means to the laborer more than physical existence, but the law fails to see how much more is meant. Even that physical existence, he thinks, is not always adequately protected. Necessity forces him to work, to accept the conditions in which work is offered. Unsanitary conditions often undermine health, overwork saps life energy, over exposure brings on disease, all of which may be as deadly as a revolver or the assassin's club. Yet the guarantee against these attacks on life in the laborer is still inadequate; it was unknown until laborers forced government to act. Again, life in the laborer's children is not protected. They enter the factory prematurely and growth is stunted, health impaired. Conditions make the home cheerless and unsanitary. Then children are often consecrated to vice before they know virtue, victims of disease before they had health, doomed to despair before they knew of hope. Life means to the laborer all that is there implied. When, then, the mason or the mechanic realizes this; when he leaves his comfortless home, "looking for a job," when he walks day after day and mile after mile in the vain search; when his bed is, perhaps, a newspaper spread on the floor of a depot waiting room; when hundreds, even thousands, of laborers have experienced more or less of what is here outlined, they feel that there is a cynical note in the protection which government gives to life. Quite often a hungry laborer will actually commit a misdemeanor in order to be arrested and placed in jail. He knows that while in jail he will be fed. The following, taken from an "Eight-Hour Primer" issued some years ago by the American Federation of Labor, expresses the situation accurately from the workingman's point of view. It is in the form of question and answer:

Q. What do you want?

A. Work.

Q. What do you want work for?

A. So I may live.

Q. You are living now; what more do you want?

A. I want to have a good deal better living. Sometimes I am hungry and I want food; I am getting ragged and I want better clothes. I sometimes have to sleep outdoors, and I want a regular and comfortable place to sleep. I am treated like a dog; I want to be treated like a man. I hate the present, and I dread the future. I shall soon be desperate and become criminal or careless and become a hardened tramp.

Q. Why don't you work?

A. I can't get work at any price.

Q. Why can't you get work?

A. Because no one will employ me.

The laborer believes that the guarantee of liberty is futile. In his philosophy of life, political, economic and social liberty merge into one. Formal differences are not always soothing when material conditions are painful. The laborer believes that economically he is a slave. He is not a party to the wages contract; his liberty in the supreme act of his temporal life, fixing wages and conditions of work, is, in fact, not protected by law. Even in his acts as a citizen he feels that he is hampered. Formerly men were told directly how they were to vote. The law now guarantees secrecy of ballot, but intimidation is still effective. The threat to close the factory or shops unless Smith or Jones is elected serves its purpose. A few days before the recent election a prominent railroad official announced that he had just placed an order for 9,000 cars; but that it would be rescinded unless a certain candidate for the Presidency were elected. This may have been well meant; that it tended to intimidate the laborers concerned is certain. The law recognizes in the laborer the right to organize, yet employers can and do at times effectively prevent laboring men from exercising that right by refusing to employ or threatening to discharge them if they belong to labor unions.

The equality which our institutions are supposed to foster is likewise found by the laborer to be only a vain promise. He believes that neither economically nor politically nor socially is he the equal of his fellow-citizens. He believes that our social organization rests on the idea of property rather than man, hence that they who have no property are in fact not the equals of those who have. Since opportunity depends largely on property, there is not equality as regards opportunity. Neither is there, in taking advantage of legal protection of common rights. There is so much time and money required "to go to law" that laborers quite generally look to law for no assistance. A laborer stated to the Senate committee which investigated the relations of labor and capital in 1884: "We expect no protection at all from the law as a general rule, because it is so expensive that we cannot take advantage of it."² Other ways in which the laborer's interpretation of equality is violated will occur to the reader. It is quite natural, then, that the pursuit of happiness, a thought fundamental to our institutions, is regarded as practically closed to the laborer. Happiness for him would be found in the margin of life wider than mere existence; in education, culture, happy home life, with children surrounded by safe, healthy protection. But the conditions actually force him into a home that is

² Report, Vol. I., p. 15.

cheerless, his labor exhausts him, his children are drawn into the stream of industrial activity by forces beyond him. Thus the elements of happiness for the laborer vanish. Many laborers resented the "Full Dinner Pail" issue in the recent campaign. Intended as a picturesque presentation of the prosperity argument, it was received with bitterness by those who saw in it an insult to themselves; who saw in it, to quote a Chicago Alderman, "the wages of a horse."

This is, in outline, the laborer's survey of the fundamental purpose of government and of his actual situation. He is inclined to regard government as a failure. Coming to concrete conditions, his initial suspicion seems to meet overwhelming confirmation. Within the field of actual governmental activity he finds himself and his needs neglected. Wars for humanity, crusades to civilize, diplomacy and intrigue, commerce and conquest busy government, while the vital problems of national industrial life are all but ignored. Messages of Presidents and Governors are scanned in vain to find proof of sympathy with labor and its wrongs. Legislatures seem to be equally indifferent. Laborers approach them to seek protection, not as citizens to representative, but as suppliants. They plead for recognition and while pleading discover, or seem to discover, that representatives of wealth, of corporations, of employers have preceded them and won a sympathetic hearing. When, however, the laborer is heard and possibly a commission is created whose purpose it is to investigate the conditions of labor, its personnel is so made up that laborers lack confidence; when its report is made—if it is made—it seems to result in no great good. Even more, if a law is actually enacted protecting the interests of labor it may easily be rendered ineffective by the employer. The right of laborers to organize is practically nullified when employers will require that workmen state under oath that they belong to no union, and that they will join no labor union within a given period. Again, the law, *e. g.*, in Pennsylvania requires that wages be paid every two weeks if desired; it also forbids companies to force employes to patronize company stores. Wages are paid every two weeks, if desired, and laborers may buy where they choose. But in the mines those who ask their wages every two weeks or who fail to patronize the company store are blacklisted. Then when some one or many must be laid off, such are chosen; when a part of the mine yields poorly, such are sent there. Laws made in the interests of labor are very often declared by the courts to be unconstitutional because they are "class legislation" or violate freedom of contract. Again, in construing common or statute law the courts seem to favor an interpretation which sacrifices the laborer and his rights to some vague principle

of law. Then the laborer believes that the reckless use of injunctions by the courts against workingmen and nearly always directly to the advantage of an employer proves undeniably that the most sacred of our institutions is captured by his enemy. "Workingmen are as helplessly the slaves of the judicial system of the United States as the Italian impoverished workingmen are of the monarchical system of Italy."³ Furthermore, the laborer finds that executives frequently call out militia to suppress strikes or disturbances, because public order is destroyed and property menaced. He points out that when employers are law breakers no military forces are called into requisition to protect laborers and their rights. Not only that, but employers themselves actually succeed in using the law as an instrument by which to oppress laborers.

Contact with political parties, which are an organic part of our national life, tends to confirm the laborer's pessimism. Democrat denounces Republican and Republican denounces Democrat; epithets, insinuations, open charges of everything from treason to theft are exchanged without hesitation. Votes are purchased; devotion to the "rights of man" is professed by rival candidates unblushingly. As a result the laborer very often suspects the sincerity of all parties and looks for help from them with but little hope. Were he not easily flattered, shortsighted and quickly captured by empty phrases, at times the result might be more serious than it is.

Thus along the entire line of civic hope and action, from the towering phrase, "Life, Liberty, Equality and the Pursuit of Happiness," down to the bi-monthly payment of wages, the laborer believes that he finds government a failure, law ineffective, our political institutions a means of oppression, public officials corrupt, the courts in the hands of his industrial enemy and political parties insincere. Language like the following, therefore, has serious meaning: "Organized capital is arrayed against organized labor. It has taken its stand against fair wages and honest labor. It is arrayed in the unholy conspiracy of lowering the standard of living of families of the laboring masses. It is becoming a synonym for organized injustice, heartless cruelty and soulless aggression. With the help of a servile press, it is a menace to human brotherhood, is an ever increasing evil. It is in complete control of our government. It controls executives, the legislative bodies, the courts and the army. By combination and lawless aggression it is attempting to control industry, destroy competitors, break up labor unions, lower wages and enthrone itself as the monarch of industry, of government, of society."⁴ Equally emphatic is the view of the *Ma-*

³ "Locomotive Firemen's Magazine," September, 1900. ⁴ "Spokane Labor Journal," quoted in "Locomotive Firemen's Magazine," September, 1899.

chinists' Monthly Journal.⁵ "The present iniquitous system has put parasites in public office, debauched every Legislature in the land, degraded parties, polluted the ballot and made elections a saturnalia of corruption." The climax in the development of such sentiments is reached when we find that the congress of Colorado railway organizations declared last summer: "We believe that representative government is a failure."

By the side of this increasing hopelessness as regards government the conviction becomes stronger day by day that laborers must depend on law, on government or on an effective substitute for protection and elevation. They have determined on self help. Out of this hopelessness and this determination has sprung the labor union. It is labor's act of despair in government and hope in itself. "Despite all high sounding preambles and resolutions, despite all protests of a mutual desire for equity and justice, despite all the weaknesses that have developed in the economy or the policy of the trades union, in it alone have we been able to discover a means of protection for the toiler against oppression and wrong."⁶

All despair possesses some latent bitterness which is easily provoked and all determination may quickly become fierce; this two-fold change has taken place in the attitude of laborers. Those among them who are active, are conscious of high ethical motives; altruism is the spirit, justice the purpose in all that they deliberately attempt. This is seen from the following, taken from a letter by Mr. Gompers, which had not been intended for publication: "Liberty, the conception of which is a matter of growth, a matter of education and is a matter of progress, proceeds in the same ratio that the people conceive their rights and will manfully, heroically and with self-sacrifice stand for it, and which no power in the form of government can stand. It is the purpose of the trade union movement to instill this larger manhood, this greater self reliance, this intelligence, this independence in the hearts and minds of the workers. . . ."⁷ Laborers find that the institutions under which they suffer know only egoism as a principle and wealth or power as their purpose. They find commercialism, dishonesty, trickery everywhere. The contrast is, for the laborer, striking; it strengthens his conviction in the justice of his cause. Nevertheless laborers are very generally misunderstood; as a result of the misunderstanding, condemned; as a result of the condemnation, scorned.

Laborers believe that they are habitually misunderstood and misrepresented by the press. The great newspaper is primarily an in-

⁵ July, 1898. ⁶ "Iron Moulders' Journal," November, 1900. ⁷ Letter to Mr. Boyce, President of Western Federation of Miners, on the occasion of the mine troubles in Idaho. The letter was published by the U. S. Senate, Document 42, Fifty-sixth Congress, First Session.

vestment. It is capitalistic, it represents the employing class. Hence the laborer believes that by colored statements, partial truths and falsehood, it constantly harms his cause by misleading the public. The Chicago Federation of Labor once determined to send a committee to Springfield to force through, a law compelling newspapers to publish only the truth. Through the press, misunderstanding is widespread; the purposes, methods, mistakes, actions of laborers are constantly placed in a false light. The laborer sees so clearly and others fail to see. He wishes no strikes and people persist in thinking that he does. He loves order, peace and safety, and the world accuses him of loving anarchy, riot and bloodshed.⁸ He struggles for what he regards as justice, and he is accused of seeking luxury. He desires a home, and he is suspected of wishing a palace. An employer who testified before a sub-committee of the present Industrial Commission said: "Make it easy for the workingmen to get a home and strikes will cease. . . . I attended an anarchist meeting on Lake street not long ago, and I found that the longing to have a home was the inspiration of every man at that meeting."⁹ The home for which laborers long means nothing more than "good, comfortable clothes, good, comfortable fare, good, comfortable shelter," to quote a member of the committee which investigated conditions in 1884. Whatever be thought of the aspiration, however the world at large takes it, laborers regard such a home as a necessity, the object of legitimate seeking, and they know that society has made it impossible for them to have it. Another form of misunderstanding is found when laborers in general are condemned as approving excesses which they actually repudiate and which are due exclusively to local or accidental conditions. An illustration is found in a statement attributed to a prominent army officer on the occasion of the mine troubles in Idaho: "Since the trouble largely originates in hostile organizations of men known as labor unions, I should suggest a law making the formation of such unions or kindred societies a crime."¹⁰ Recalling the contrast in purpose, motive and spirit as viewed by the laborer, between him and his enemy, we can easily realize that this widespread misunderstanding will not be without its effect. A spirit of resentment is engendered, a tone of vindictiveness is heard; the latent bitterness of the laborer's despair becomes a force; the latent fierceness of his determination to help himself becomes a power. This development may aid us in explaining the habit of exaggeration in statement and excess in action so

⁸ Emma Goldman, the anarchist, offered her services to the strikers in Chicago last spring. Her interference was resented by the laborers, who would not recognize her. She had expressed supreme contempt for the American workmen before that, as they were impervious to her ideas. "Chicago Chronicle," March 15, 1900; "New York Daily News," November 22, 1899. ⁹ "Chicago Chronicle," March 23, 1900. ¹⁰ "Locomotive Firemen's Magazine," September, 1899.

often witnessed among laborers: the attitude of suspicion toward even those who wish to aid them; the spirit of intolerance, so unlike what one would expect in such a movement: phases of the action of laborers regretted and repressed by none, more eagerly and persistently than by the more thoughtful in their own ranks.

Coming more closely to the heart of the situation, we find laborer and employer face to face in the determined struggle. The employer epitomizes history and actual institutions in the mind of the laborer. Movements are judged, institutions tested, laws appreciated by their bearing on the employer. The eye of the laborer is fixed; he gazes eagerly, intently upon him and through him the laborer reads his social philosophy. The laborer's view of the employer then is the laborer's view of society, law, government. Now, in dealings between laborer and employer the dominant sense is that of master and servant, dictator and subject; all obligations rest on the laborer, all rights centre in the employer. The power of the individual employer is great. It is increased by understandings with other employers as to wages, men, etc. The best expression of this power—that most hated by laborers—is found in the blacklist. For the employer, thus superior to the laborer, everything is business, curt, matter of fact, calculating business.¹¹ Business is heartless. Safety appliances on railroads were long resisted because the companies seemed to think less of the lives of their men than of the expense entailed by the change. Guards and covering for dangerous machinery in factories were reluctantly introduced when law compelled it. Incompetent engineers, whose ignorance caused the loss of many lives in iron works formerly, were cheaper than skilled engineers under whom loss of life was extremely rare. Great business men sometimes recognize no ethics in business. A prominent trust magnate stated to the Industrial Commission recently: "I do not care two cents for your ethics. I do not know enough of them to apply them."¹² The kindly consideration of vital human rights in laborers, rights which, in their eyes, give all sacredness to institutions and all sanction to authority, are ignored. Yet watchfulness, care, attention, interest, even enthusiasm are demanded from laborers and they are forced to manifest all. One workingman can quickly ruin a brand of cigars, a cotton or wool worker can materially affect the quality of the product, an engineer or brakeman can cause untold destruction. They all know that they have the power, but they dare not use it. Innocent as well as guilty would be punished and necessity or starvation would be the outcome. Employers have the advantage; laborers are in their power. By the

¹¹ An accurate presentation of this view may be found in the "Railway Trainmen's Journal," July, 1899. ¹² Preliminary Report, Part I., Testimony, p. 118.

side of that consciousness laborers entertain the conviction that they alone produce wealth; that accumulations of capital are filched from labor; that the employer is a robber who ignores natural justice. The laborer believes that he is the equal of the employer. "We feel that the workman of the present is the equal of his employer in every way other than financially, even though we are forced to admit that the equality is impaired by those in whom we have placed the law-creating and law-applying functions of our government."¹⁸ The result of this phase of the whole situation seems to be that a deep sense of injustice is engendered. The laborer's attitude to government, courts and legislation is of a general character. Here we have a concrete issue, a particular relation. Laborers feel that they are robbed; wealth thus taken is employed to oppress them. Hopelessness made bitter and determination become fierce, welcome a new element—one of tremendous power—the sense of grave injustice.

In all social movements, even in all human conduct, doubt may be a source of much weakness; but opportune doubt is certainly the proof of much wisdom. Laborers never doubt. Among those actively engaged in the movement there is the deep abiding conviction that they are right. This conviction, like many others in human history, is not so much the product of thinking as the result of feeling. It possesses all the force, persistence and consciousness that any mental state can have. It is a conviction which makes unselfishness easy and heroism a matter of fact, one which converts men into apostles, dull men into orators, mild men into aggressive leaders, aggressive men into fanatics and drives enthusiasts into the ranks of hopeless idealism or anarchy. Like all deep convictions it is a source of light when guarded, a source of blindness when seen alone; a power for good when properly related or modified, a power for destruction when unrestrained. Such is the tyranny of this conviction over the minds of the laborers who share it fully, that they are often blindly obstinate; they lose all sense of adjustment; the faculty of toleration is destroyed, the power to see limitations to their principles or reasons for compromise is largely lost. All great truths must be taught slowly. Teachers must have the sense of situation and be guided by it; they must know the "psychological moment" and use it. Laborers who are most aggressive seem unable to do so. There are apparent contradictions of a vital kind in their gospel; they forget them; there are times when insisting on a fantastic application of a principle excites ridicule; yet they insist. The President of the United States could not lay the corner-stone of the Federal Building in Chicago unless

¹⁸ "Railway Trainmen's Journal," April, 1899.

he became a member of the Stone Mason's Union. He actually did so by accepting a membership card. Later there was a threat to expel him because he allowed United States troops to be sent to Idaho to quiet the labor troubles there. The incident awakened widespread dislike and condemnation of labor unions in the West and it contributed in no visible manner to the triumph of union principles.

Finally laborers are convinced that they have a high and holy mission to humanity, to save civilization, to bring material redemption to man. They feel and teach a responsibility to society on this account; appeals to the sacred character of the mission are frequently made. Massive pauperism is to be exterminated, wives and children are to be saved, oppressors are to be dethroned, they who labor and sit in darkness and mourn are to receive power. Earnestness is increased by laborers' belief that processes now at work will quickly bring disaster unless checked. The constantly increasing centralization of industry augments daily the employers' opportunity to oppress labor. Improvement in machinery, it is thought, will rapidly displace labor and render workingmen still more helpless. The mission is, then, to reorganize society that it may be protected; man will be the basis of reorganization, brotherhood its law and inspiration, equality its ideal. It is the teaching of trade unions "that the only hope for society and civilization, that the only freedom is through organization, and it should stimulate every worker in the movement to work as he has never worked before to spread organization to every craft and calling until the workers of the world are solidly united. Then will war with all its failures and disasters disappear, and the new civilization, which is the brotherhood of man, take place."¹⁴ Similarly the President of the American Federation of Labor stated before the American Social Science Congress, September 2, 1891: "We are carrying the standard for which men in all ages have suffered exile, imprisonment and death by rack and stake and gibbet." The fight is to be kept up "till the last enemy of industrial freedom is routed and economic emancipation secured to a free and independent people."

It was stated on a preceding page that there are many sources of uncertainty in a study such as this. The exposition of the laborer's point of view attempted here is not, cannot be entirely correct. It is at most an approximation. Each sentiment to which attention has been called actually comes to expression often in labor circles. But what does that expression mean, passing rage or settled hatred, pompous and reckless talk or genuine declarations of deep feeling? It seems safe to say, while waiving that question, that the view out-

¹⁴ A contributor in "American Federationist," August, 1898.

lined is one actually shared by a goodly number; furthermore, it is the view toward which the whole labor movement seems to be consciously and rapidly tending; it is the view by which the meaning and power of the movement can be best understood. In psychological generalizations caution is necessary. All of those elements are not found in every laborer any more than are all the elements of the Catholic or the American spirit found in every Catholic or every American. That phases of this view are found among nearly all laborers is quite certain. Between that great number in whom some of this spirit is found and the smaller number in whom the spirit entire is found there is a series of stages which defies classification. These observations should be kept in mind to hinder us from exaggeration after reading the description here offered. We may now seek to study the modifications of the view and the obstacles to development which it actually meets.

Women and children constitute a large portion of our working population. In the labor movement, however, they are sufferers or spectators rather than actors. They do, in fact, exert a very great influence as the object of solicitude for husbands and fathers who protest because those whom they love suffer. The phlegmatic, the stupid, many of the selfish and prosperous and the inert among laboring men may also be eliminated from our study for the moment. They may share in a way more or less of the view in question, but in them it does not become a vital force. We have narrowed the field to the more thorough, more intelligent, sympathetic and progressive. In them the view is a power; among them the labor union begins to be. Among them, I say, for the labor movement is broader than labor unions. The broader movement can scarcely be outlined, but that is not necessary for the moment. The labor union is the most concrete, most powerful, most positive phase of the movement. On that very account it itself has become a vital issue. In the group of laborers to which attention is now directed we find three divisions. Many—maybe one and one-half million—believe that the union is the only means by which laborers can be saved; others do not believe such to be the case.¹⁵ What they think positively I do not attempt to say. Others are carried to extremes; they work out the logical consequences of the view and become socialists or anarchists. Between these two fractions of the working population labor unions have a difficult position. Since they have been kept in mind throughout this study as fairly if not thoroughly representative, we shall proceed to examine how these new phases affect the situation.

¹⁵ Some enter unions through fear of them: some do not enter because of expense, though they believe in unionism.

The unionist is dominated by the "class idea." The individual is merged into the class; he must serve the class, fight for it, because through class action alone will safety come. He must surrender personal liberty, act under corporate class direction, work when and where the union permits. Great as is the sacrifice, the unionist makes it readily and assumes the financial burdens implied. But the non-unionist, the "rat" or the "scab," recoils from this. The class idea does not animate him. To work when permitted and to strike when ordered; to go hungry and to see wife and children in misery when work is abundant—to do this if required is too much. Yet such are expected union demands. Unionist, with class idea, and non-unionist, with the idea of personal independence, clash; as a rule the strike is the occasion of battle. The union striking, hopes to punish the employer by enforced idleness; hence work is suspended. If the non-unionist offers to replace the striker and is accepted, the strike is robbed of efficacy. The unionist sees in his enemy, union philosophy baffled, union methods cheated of result, union sacrifice nullified and union progress checked. The non-unionist sees in the other, arrogant assumption of authority, unjustifiable interference with personal liberty; the right not to organize is as sacred to him as is the right to organize to the unionist. The two parties have taken an attitude of unconcealed hatred; they war with each other even to death. Very often, then, the employer is the *tertius gaudens*.

This hatred must be added as another element in the view which we are studying. From it the movement receives much of its "bad temper." To it may be ascribed most of the riots, bloodshed and destruction of property which have characterized labor troubles.¹⁶ In a strike where non-union men do not appear as antagonists we generally find good order. During the recent strike in Pennsylvania every agitator and organizer urged the strikers to remain at home, avoid drink and even protect the company's property. The strike was one of the most orderly yet determined which we have witnessed in recent years.

As remarked a moment ago, the labor union has to reckon with the socialist. He has simply gone farther in the same line as that traveled by the union. He tries to urge the union forward, while it attempts to restrain him. Feeling here is not at all as intense as in the case of the non-unionist. Many socialists have been, many actually are, members of trades unions. The opposition of the

¹⁶ Recently the non-union men in the Machine Trades in Columbus formed a union against unions. They accept manufacturers, superintendents and others as honorary members. They are pledged against strikes and boycotts. The settlement of wage questions is declared to be "of private individual privilege of adjustment."

unions to socialism rests on expediency, not at all on principle. The columns of the labor press are open to the socialist. When he attempts to control a labor convention or to secure the adoption of a platform pledged to socialism and political action, then there is a struggle. But the contest is more or less good natured; hence its effect on the temper of the movement is secondary.

Were the point of view described uniformly taken by all the members of trade organizations it would result in a revolution such as we can scarcely imagine. The best friends of organized labor may still be loyal while thankful that many circumstances prevent the view from developing to the depth and with the rapidity which one might expect at first glance. The view is present in all its elements, but the concentration which would make it dangerous and the unity which would make it irresistible are lacking.

Geographically our laborers are widely scattered; the fatal distinction of local interests exists. Our individual States are supreme in nearly all questions affecting labor. The sense of solidarity is materially affected by this condition. Within the State, variety among industries creates diversified interests. As a rule, no time finds all trades suffering. The spirit of discontent does not wax strong when the laborer is prosperous. The federation idea among American unions aims to correct this situation. We have city, state and national unions of trades; city and state federations of unions, and last of all, the national federation, known as the American Federation of Labor. Some powerful unions are not affiliated with the Federation. Yet they recognize that individualism among unions is disastrous. Hence the attempt made in a convention in Toledo last summer to unite the five great railroad organizations more closely, viz.: Engineers, Firemen, Conductors, Trainmen and Switchmen. This division among unions—lack of coöperation rather—is a serious obstacle to the development of the power of the unions as a whole.

Strangely enough, the organized laborers have their own "social classes," their own aristocracy. Men who belong to some branches of industry regard themselves as "above" those who belong to other trades, not held in such good repute. Wives and children share the feeling; possibly they are in a way to be blamed for it. A well-known official of a great railroad organization once said that no four dollar a day man can afford to go on a sympathetic strike for a one dollar a day man. Social differences exist; they are a barrier to class solidarity. While they will not prevent individuals or unions from sharing the laborer's point of view fully, they prevent the fusion of views and the development of one uniform consciousness—of a far-reaching solidarity. In that fusion rests labor's only hope.

Party allegiance is another important factor. A strong Democrat or Republican who is a member of a labor union may not take squarely the laborer's point of view. Instead of losing confidence in government and legislatures, he will to a certain extent blame his political opponents for many of labor's wrongs, and he will look to his own party for redress. Naturally the party press favors such a tendency. So true is it that party ties produce this effect that recently it was urged as an argument of great force against the establishment of a union daily paper. Union men would not support such a daily, it was claimed, since they prefer to read a paper which is the recognized organ of their parties. I do not believe that this has as great influence as one might infer; what the effect is cannot, of course, be very accurately stated.

Again, a great number of valuable men are lost to the labor movement in various ways. The movement is a campaign; it requires leadership; its leaders must be trusted; they must be men of ability, experience and power. Many who show capacity for leadership are promoted in business; they are advanced until they are lost to the labor movement. Tricksters and politicians sometimes work their way to power as leaders and then betray the trust. Sometimes the movement is ungrateful and it forces out, men whose genius might be of greatest service to the cause which the unions represent.

It is difficult for us to realize what the trade union means—difficult to measure the process by which a slight local protest has been transformed into a force affecting our institutions, coloring our social philosophy and actually pointing in the direction in which society must proceed. There can be no question that the labor unions mean this. It were wise then to understand them—wise to grasp the situation. Studying facts with our eyes will never discover to us the secret power of the labor movement. We must see, hear, feel, think as the laborer does. In this study such has been the aim. No plea is made for or against the laborer—for or against the employer. The plea is that we understand views as well as facts. Were that more generally kept in mind, less writing would be necessary and more would be done to alleviate conditions which we all regret.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Washington, D. C.

CATHOLIC FEATURES IN THE OFFICIAL REPORT ON EDUCATION.

INTENSE interest was manifested recently in regard to the tiny planet named Eros, because of its utility in the determination of some astronomical problems at a certain phase. In the geometric appearances on the surface of Mars not a few men of eminence betray a concern almost feverish at certain periods in the planet's rotation. The apparent eccentricities of Algol, the demon star, as it is called, continue to furnish mental exertion for very many estimable men of science. Other celestial facts claim the attention of learned individuals and bodies in these States, by day as well as by night, and shorten the hours that ought to be devoted to sleep. But, from all that we have been enabled to see or hear, or connote in any way whatsoever, not one in a thousand of those erudite and philosophic persons gives the smallest consideration to phenomena much more relative to human concerns, and infinitely more valuable to the true philosopher. We refer to the phenomena of the world of education, as revealed in the annual Reports of the Commissioner for that department of the United States Government.

More than once it has been our pleasant duty to call attention to the manifold merits of these periodical statements, yet it is a singular fact that their annual appearance is productive of little or no comment in the public press. So far as we have been enabled to observe, no publication of note beside our own has ever taken the trouble to analyze any of the very important *résumés* presented by the Commissioner and his contributors, and but very scant notice of the Reports has been taken by the daily press. The briefest statement of the number of pupils attending the different grades of schools, and the percentage of scholars to population, as a rule suffices to satisfy the curiosity of the public, so far as that sentiment finds reflection in the leading papers. Such a result is not just. It would appear to indicate an apathy about the question of education in general on the part of the population of the United States such as by no means exists, or else an indifference to the work of the Commissioner most ungenerous and unjust.

It is a serious evil that such apathy should prevail over so important a subject as this, and some effort ought to be made to ascertain why it is so and some corrective applied. Possibly a reason might be looked for in the bulky character of the annual Reports. These are usually presented in two volumes, each containing about

twelve hundred pages. Most of this is in small type, taking about seven hundred words to a page; so that the reader who would like to learn all he could on the subject would be face to face with the task of wading through nearly a million seven hundred thousand words, besides tabulated statistics in bewildering profusion. Possibly more attention would be secured by the issuance of quarterly reports, or separate statements as they are sent in, accompanied by some hint as to their relative importance as factors in the determination of special theories or experiments in the ever-engrossing problem of mind-development and the making of the perfect entity.

It is only of recent years that Catholics could find anything save of negative interest in these voluminous returns. The uninstructed stranger, glancing through them, a decade or so ago, would never have found in them any reason to suspect that there were millions of Catholics in the country maintaining a separate system of schools, and colleges, and universities of their own, without a cent's help from the public funds. Since the present Commissioner had his attention drawn to such a remarkable hiatus in statistics, it is but just to acknowledge he has endeavored to prove himself more useful to the historian, in the matter of presenting a true picture of the country's progress in the field of knowledge than he had been doing and his predecessors had done. The Report for the year 1898-99, which is now to hand, is full of matter of the highest interest to the Catholic reader.

One needs, however, to do much more than take the index headings if he would find some of the most valuable portions of history bearing on Catholicism and religious education in these little-read annuals. There are by-paths and trails to be found in the most unlikely-seeming places. For instance, as we open the volume now before us in the way most convenient for reading purposes, which is by making halves of its bulk, we find confronting us a good lengthy biographical sketch of one of the country's earlier educators, Samuel Knox, written by Dr. Steiner, of the Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, an authority on the educational development of Maryland and Connecticut. This Samuel Knox was a Presbyterian clergyman from the North of Ireland, who settled for a considerable time in the capital of Maryland and carried on academies or colleges there and in other places in the course of a somewhat checkered career. This man, full of Ulster bigotry in his heart, yet with fair-seeming principles on his lips and dropping from his pen, appears to have exercised considerable influence in the formation of public opinion on the subject of education in the State wherein Catholics had first laid down the broad principles of an enlightened toleration. By voice and pen he appears to have been incessantly ventilating his theories

on a national system of instruction from the alpha to the omega. Splendid liberality shines in some of his pronouncements. Thus in one particular publication we find him appealing to men of all religions, from Catholics to Covenanters, to beware of "interference with the religion of any man considered as a candidate for office," while in several others he is seen furiously attacking the Rev. William Du Bourg and the Sulpician Fathers who had just opened St. Mary's University at Baltimore, simply because this was carrying out an earlier suggestion of his own to the effect that all denominations provide schools of theology and religious training generally for its own teaching body. The catechism prepared by Abbé Fleury for the use of Catholic schools was in especial condemned by Knox's partisans in the violent logomachy which his attacks stirred up, as well as the "Jesuitical spirit" of the Sulpician Fathers. Able pens on the Catholic side refuted the calumnies of Knox and his supporters, and the pamphlets and letters in the public press which were elicited by the attack made a literature of very respectable dimensions. The controversy was the means of stirring up a very bitter feeling in the State, and thus effecting what Knox, at the beginning of his career therein, was so plausibly earnest in deprecating, viz., the inclusion of religious considerations amongst the qualifications for public office.

Knox's theory of national education, as formulated, did not exclude religious teaching. He would have the knowledge of God inculcated in some vague creedless way, and have a course of prayers of the non-committal order form part of the school exercise, together with the reading of some invertebrate homilies on religion, likewise morals and ethics. His programme, under this heading, as we read it now, suggests the notion that his spirit sits at the editor's desk in some of the offices wherein pabulum for the non-Catholic religious world is now produced by the week or by the month, and finds relief in the incessant aspiration after a Christianity with Christ as an abstraction and an unrestricted field for all comers as to what it is necessary to believe for the attainment of salvation. There can be little doubt that, apart from Knox's peculiar notions on matters of pedagogical detail, his views on the function of religion in education were widely held in the beginning of the several State systems, and found expression in some shape or other until they were proved to be unworkable and, so, abandoned for the present plan of total exclusion of religion from the school, the college and the university as established by the State.

The personality of this early educator bears an important relation to the genesis of the subject, as we may consider him as a type of at least one of the groups which exercised a preponderating influence

on the early stages of the evolution. He is thus described by one of his pupils, Mr. John P. Kennedy: "He was a large, coarse, austere man, with an offensive despotism in his character, which not only repelled all love, but begat universal fear and dislike among the boys. He was not much of a scholar, either, I should say, and was far from successful as a teacher. He had no pleasantries by the way, no explanations, no appeals to one's own perceptions of an author's merits."

Many other side-lights on this absorbing question will be discovered by the reader who has the leisure and the patience to wade through the different able papers bearing on the general subject included in the Report. But our limits will not permit us to do more than indicate that the search will not be fruitless. We may leave the quest here, and pass on to note something more positive in the way of proof that the Catholic aspect of the subject is no longer overlooked in the survey now annually made by the liberal-minded Commissioner, Dr. Harris.

Chief amongst such positive proofs is the inclusion in the Report of the full text of three addresses of Bishop Spalding's, on themes related to education recently. The third of these discourses is distinctively a plea for religion in education. It is entitled "The University: a Nursery of the Higher Life;" and it is introduced by an observation of Montaigne's: "In my time and country learning cures the disease of the purse fairly well; that of the soul not at all. To him who has not the science of virtue all other knowledge is harmful." As the only true science of virtue is religion, Montaigne's sententiousness in this regard assumes a peculiar significance, in view of the fact that his own philosophical tendencies at times seemed to leave him floundering in matters of belief, much as the "higher criticism" and the extravagant claims of the scientists on the subject of creation do a good many thinkers of our own particular era. It is not possible to overestimate the liberality which prompted the inclusion of these remarkable addresses, having regard to their pronounced character as pleas for Catholicism in the training of the American citizen. The most careless reader could not fail to be struck with the force of their reasoning and the singular grace and boldness of their style. They are pleas couched in the spirit of modern American notions, hortative of the search for knowledge in every visible field of inquiry and the development of every latent and active faculty of the mind for the attainment of the highest things possible to the grasp of human thought. But they are pleas for religion, above all things—for the interweaving of the spiritual with the intellectual process, in the delicate task of building up the mind's fabric in youth; and so, in a large measure out of sympathy

with, if not in actual hostility to, the principles of the system whose progress it is the Education Commissioner's official duty to register and record and, in a negative way, to philosophize upon, or at all events to prepare the materials whereof for the philosopher.

"Do we not extol the Church," queries the learned prelate, in a treatise on "The University," "for what, in ages that are gone, it accomplished in behalf of literature, art and science? Do we not hold that modern civilization is largely due to the influence of the Catholic religion?"

Now, such are not the propositions upon which the structure of public education in this country has been reared; rather the very contrary has been sedulously instilled into the minds of the people at large. Wherever it has not been sought to prove that the Church is the inveterate enemy of education, it is at least inculcated that if she did set up the university and the school, she did it with the selfish and narrow purpose of strengthening her own influence or reining in the intellect within a fixed pale of pedagogy. This vicious tendency is well exemplified in the introduction to a history of the secondary school system in the Kingdom of Hungary which forms a portion of the same volume which blazons Bishop Spalding's eulogy of the Church as a teacher. A few sentences culled from the document reveal the animus of the chronicler:

"During the earliest epoch the Church ruled supreme in educational matters in Hungary as well as in other countries. Wherever the Church stepped upon the scene the clergy, with the well understood purpose of strengthening its own position, established schools as an irresistible means for the assertion of its power. The Latin language and ecclesiastical teachers predominated, and the object of the schools consisted exclusively in preparing clergymen and believers. This tendency received a new impetus through the Reformation. The competition arising between the different denominations called into existence a new school at every step, which school was to act as a fortress of the faith. . . . Scholars who had returned from the West brought with them an eagerness to reform and remodel, much to the disadvantage of home traditions. Thus the national individuality suffered."

Here we behold cropping up the views of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists. It would be utterly unreasonable to expect the Commissioner of Education to use his blue pencil in such cases; if he did so in the one case, he certainly could not be blamed for also doing it in the other. The further he delves into the sources of education, no matter where almost, the more he finds how closely the beginnings of it had been intertwined with the history of the Church. Here is an influence that cannot be excluded; when he finds it un-

Vol. XXVI.—Sig. 9.

justly assailed, what can he do, in common fairness, but admit the pleas in defense which he finds publicly confronting him?

The ideas which permeate society in this great country to-day are found reflected in the tone of the greater number of the collective reports which make up this one official report. These ideals are chiefly secularism in education; education whose aim is summed up in the one word, "practical." If religion be not hated—and we thankfully say that such is by no means the case—it is considered, at all events, inadmissible in the curriculum, because sects are many and the brains to devise a system to meet the just requirements of all are scarce. From previous reports of the Commissioner it is permissible to infer that he himself shares the view of the secularists that a liberal education is in itself sufficient to make a man or woman all he or she needs to be—perfect in mind and body, morally and intellectually great. This being so, we cannot but confess the magnanimity which permits a scholar like Bishop Spalding to emphasize the opposite view in many memorable passages like this one:

"The universities of the past, as those of our own day, have but partially fulfilled their mission because they have failed to foster a deeper and purer moral life. Nay, often they have been and still are the nurseries of vice. The radical failure is moral failure, and the education which does not promote conduct, which does not build character, bears within itself a mortal taint. . . . When philosophy is studied as an intellectual pastime and conduct is looked upon as a matter of policy, no genuine education can be given or received.

"Religious faith and conduct are the basis of right human life, and the student who is not inspired by this principle may become a brilliant or a famous, but not a great or a noble man. . . . 'What rendered the University of Paris powerful, nay, positively formidable,' says Savigny, 'was its poverty. It did not possess so much as a building of its own, but was commonly obliged to hold its meetings in the cloisters of friendly monastic orders. Its existence thus assumed a purely spiritual character and was rendered permanently independent of the temporal order.'"

What Scotland owes to the Church and to this idea of the function of education is placed clearly enough before the readers of this interesting and impartial Report, in the course of an exceedingly fair and graphic sketch of "The Mediæval Universities of Scotland," by Professor Ritchie, of St. Andrew's. Before the foundation of any of the Universities north of the Tweed, observes Mr. Ritchie, a number of enlightened Scotch ecclesiastics formed a society for the instruction of all who chose to attend their lectures. At their head was the Abbot of Scone, Peter of Lindores, who expounded phil-

osophy as taught by Peter Lombard, the great authority of the Middle Ages; others expounded theology; others again canonical and civil law. Then the Scottish universities grew up, as did those of Paris and Bologna, by a sort of voluntary process on the part of successive enthusiasts in the cause of education—Churchmen all—and in due time came the Popes' bulls authorizing the formal establishment of St. Andrew's, Glasgow, and Aberdeen."

It is at this point that we would like to invite the reader's attention to the momentous bearing on civilization, in its broadest meaning, which the process called the Reformation had on the work of the university everywhere. We have seen how the Hungarian chronicler deprecated the influence for evil, from his point of view, which the foreign university had on the Hungarian student. It affected his national sentiment. It made him broad-minded. The mediæval European university was cosmopolitan. Students of all the "nations" residing at these centres fraternized in the noble brotherhood of learning and philosophy. Every best civilizing influence was there exerted to promote the brotherhood of man and the extinction of ancient feuds. The "Reformation" came to undo all this beneficent work. It scattered the "nations" and hunted the teachers with the "dogs of war" for many woful years. The influence of the Church on this great process of consolidating the different States is thus graphically outlined by Professor Ritchie:

"In the Papal bull for the foundation of St. Andrew's a term is used as convertible with *universitas studii*, which originally had a distinct meaning—*studium generale*. This term contains more of the meaning we usually connect with a university, but it is likewise often misunderstood. It does not mean an institution for the study of all sorts of subjects, but an institution for students from all quarters of the world, as distinct from a merely local school. It was this cosmopolitan character of the mediæval universities which brought the Pope into special connection with them. It came to be recognized that only the Pope, or the Holy Roman Emperor (in those countries which acknowledged his authority) could confer the necessary privileges; and thus even studia, which had arisen and acquired a more than local reputation independently of Papal and imperial authority, came to apply for Papal bulls and imperial charters. It is this, also, which explains the way in which the universities of one country came to influence the type of those in another, irrespective of neighborhood or of political ties—how, *e. g.*, the universities of Scotland bear more resemblance to those of Italy and of Germany and of the Low Countries than to those of England, or even of Scotland's ancient political ally, France."

Here it should be observed that although the universities were

potent in inducing the broad spirit of cosmopolitanism among the students, and so coöperating with the systematic Papal policy of peace among all the European States, it was not obnoxious to the principle of nationality. It will be remembered that Mr. Andrew Lang, in his recent work on "John Knox and His Times," bore unqualified testimony to the sturdy nationalism of the Scottish bishops in all the disputes with England, previous to the disastrous "Reformation" days. When the Hungarian commentator sets down that deterioration in the national character was a result of the habit of sending students to the foreign university, if we accept the statement as reliable, we are driven, by a comparison of the two cases, to the conclusion that the national spirit in the average Hungarian was not a plant of as lusty a growth as its congener that grew in "Caledonia stern and wild." Before the blighting influence of Knox and the English conspirators who plotted the extinction of Scotland's faith and nationality was felt over the land, the Catholic nobles, though turbulent, were patriotic; thenceforward they mostly "sat on the fence" or took sides with the Saxon.

Men of thought, true scholars and educators, deplore all things which make for the hostility of nations and individuals. It is the men of evil mind who cry out for war and arrogance of man toward weaker man. Professor Ritchie sees nothing but loss to civilization in the destruction of the old character of the university. He winds up his interesting paper with this sobering retrospect and reflection:

"The immediate effect of the ecclesiastical revolutions of the sixteenth century was to destroy, to a great extent, the international character of the universities and to make them merely national institutions. Scotland was, indeed, in some respects less cut off from the Continent than England. Scottish students, after the Reformation, resorted to Leyden and Utrecht, as in older days they went to Paris or Bologna. In this century we are recovering a little of the international academic sentiment between students of different countries; and it is a most valuable sentiment, which may make more for peace and civilization than much of the work of statesmen and ambassadors."

It is not often that we meet with such frank testimony from a Protestant authority to the beneficent influence of the Papacy and the system of Catholic teaching of which it was the universal patron. Such an admission as this compensates for whole volumes of stupid misrepresentation of the aims and objects of Catholicism such as those upon which the Protestant population of this country have habitually been nurtured. Vain and impotent must prove the efforts of writers like the Rev. James M. King to poison the wells of history while there be magnanimous souls like Mr. Andrew Lang

and this Glasgow professor to come forward as the champions of truth.

In the annual Report preceding the one now under review there appeared a series of papers of an exceedingly valuable character on Education in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, by R. L. Packard. They were distinguished by impartial historical statement, exhaustive statistical analysis, and a manifest desire to lay the truth before the world no matter to whom it might be disagreeable or disappointing. In this new volume we find another set of reports on the same subject, but by a different writer. We often meet the name, F. F. Hilder, in the Commissioner's collations, and chiefly in connection with countries of Spanish settlement; and we have noted that he is invariably out of sympathy with the subject, so far as the religion of the people is concerned, and has little good to say for the clergy or the efforts made by them to educate the people. In the particular paper now under notice this tendency is particularly marked. He begins by blaming the religious orders in the Philippines for not beginning the educational process by starting primary schools instead of colleges. In face of facts well known to every reader, such an objection looks exceedingly puerile. It would be exceedingly hard for any one to put his finger on any country in the world where education did not begin from the top, which was the only way, indeed, in which it could begin, and perfectly in accordance with the natural law. It is true, says F. F. Hilder, that "schools were established throughout the islands, but little progress was made in them, as the teachers did not understand Spanish, and what little rudiments of education the children acquired were forgotten when they left the schools." The result of the system is, he adds, that a large proportion of the Filipinos are "woefully uneducated." This conclusion seems to be one of those dangerous things known as half-truths. The whole world knows now that a large proportion of the Filipinos are either savages quite or semi-savages; that a considerable number are Mahommedans, slave-dealers, and polygamists, and so, perhaps, wholly irreclaimable. Their condition is not due to any fault of the religious orders, but is chiefly owing to the inaccessibility of their *habitat*, physical obstacles and climatic conditions. It is downright dishonesty to hold either the Spanish Government or the religious orders in any degree responsible for the social conditions of such people. The glaring character of the suppression is still more evident when we recall the fact that Spanish missionaries went repeatedly among these wild tribes, and often paid the penalty of their beneficent efforts for their reclamation with their lives.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that while Mr. Packard,

in preparing his report, strove to do justice to the religious orders both as educators and social uplifters, his successor was desirous of ignoring their claims and holding them responsible for conditions over which they had no control. Mr. Packard shows the Spanish clergy not only as Christianizers and schoolmasters, but as stout defenders of the people's civil rights. He traces the efforts of the Spanish officials and commercial speculators to exploit the natives for gain, in the same way as the same class did in the South American settlements among the Indians, and he shows how the clergy, animated by the spirit of Las Casas, put their backs against the wall and said the iniquity should not be. What the Spanish rulers called the "Encomienda" was introduced into the Philippines in the year 1581. It was a species of slavery—forced labor, in lieu of which the laborer got food, some little pay and some pen to sleep in. Practically it amounted to serfdom. To the Filipinos, who had had, long before the Spaniards arrived, a tribal constitution, with *fueros* of their own, the Encomienda system was maddening. But their antagonism to it would have been futile, probably, were it not backed up by the stern remonstrances of the clergy throughout the settlements. These were not content with protesting to the Crown officials in the archipelago, but took care that their remonstrance should reach the ears of the King. The strong step had an immediate effect. His Majesty issued a decree putting an end to the Encomienda system and decrying all other forms of extortion practised by the officials. These wrongs had been so flagrant that the clergy begged the King to be allowed to return to Spain if they were not stopped, inasmuch as they could not stand by and see them perpetrated by the heartless tribe let loose upon the people by the colonial government.

Now, with regard to the "woefully uneducated" condition of the islanders, as charged by F. F. Hilder, Mr. Packard quotes an abundance of eminent authorities to the contrary. He cites M. Alfred Marche's "Six Years of Travel in the Philippines" (Paris, 1887), who found five alphabets in use among the islanders and schools, under the control of the priests, "in every village." The love of the people for music M. Marche found to be remarkable. In every village there is Mass, he says, and music at every Mass. The music of the bands in Manila he judged to be as good as what he heard in Madrid. Nearly all the Tagalos, he declares, can read and write. Instruction among the Indians, he observes, is far from being backward when compared with the position of the lower classes in Europe. The monks at St. Tomás had published a Tagalo grammar and dictionary, and a combined grammar of the Tagale, Bicol, Visaya and Isinay languages. Semper, another experienced explorer,

but one evidently hostile to the Church, is also quoted by R. L. Packard. "Every village," he says, "has its public school, in which instruction is obligatory," but he objects that besides reading and writing, only Christian doctrine and Church music are taught in these primary schools. Jagor, another authority quoted, adds that the teachers were obliged to impart a knowledge of Spanish, although, paradoxically enough, he adds that they did not know it themselves. In introducing further testimony to the same effect by the great authority, Blumentritt, R. L. Packard shows his spirit of justice by remarking that while other men go forth in search of adventure inspired by purely selfish motives, the Catholic priests went all over the world, encountering death everywhere, from the woods of Canada to the remotest parts of China, impelled only by the spirit of "self-sacrifice and devotion for what they believed to be the spiritual welfare of savages and heathen."

How different this from the faint praise or scrupulous suppression by F. F. Hilder!

It would, finally, seem as though the Commissioner himself were conscious of the shortcomings of the latter's statement, inasmuch as in the Introduction he embodies a statement of Senor Agoncillo's regarding the educational and intellectual status of the Filipinos, which more than bears out the favorable estimate of European observers. Two schools, he states, are to be found in every large town; and if the population exceed five thousand, the number of schools is correspondingly increased. Their scope, he says, is much the same as that of the American schools. They teach, besides, something more than reading and writing; Christian doctrine, the Catechism and church music. Geography, grammar, the Spanish language, arithmetic and history are likewise taught the pupils; and the teachers are mostly native priests who have passed the course in the normal college.

As if in order to remove all possibility of misconception as to his own attitude, the Commissioner also calls upon Blumentritt for a conclusive judgment. "The Filipinos have a greater proportion of educated people among them than the Kingdom of Servia or the Principalities of Bulgaria and Montenegro. There are fewer illiterates among them than in the States of the Balkan Peninsula, in Russia, in many provinces of Spain and Portugal, and the Latin Republics of South America. The Filipinos pay more attention to schools than Spain or the Balkan States."

Weighing all the facts presented in this voluminous Report, the Catholic philosopher must find much that is consoling and hopeful in the phenomena which it reflects. On the one side he finds the hand of enlightened impartiality sweeping away the cobwebs of

prejudice regarding the aim of the Papacy in the glorious work of intellectual uplifting; on the other the steady persistence of the clergy in the same cause, after the work had been rudely interrupted in Europe by the revolt of heresy, in face of death and danger in the trackless wilds of the new-found world. If the pen of prejudice and jealousy would fain belittle the results of those splendid sacrifices, the spirit of fair play at the fountain-head arises to rebuke the injustice and let the impartial world judge for itself on whose brows should rest the palm of merit.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

THE SECOND PLENARY SYNOD OF MAYNOOTH.

IN the Pastoral addressed to the faithful of the Church in Ireland by the Fathers of the Plenary Synod of Thurles we find these words: "Our enactments we shall immediately submit with the profoundest reverence and submission to the judgment of the Apostolic See; and we will not publish them until we shall have obtained the necessary approbation." The Fathers of the First Synod of Maynooth say in their Pastoral: "In accordance with canonical usage, the results of our deliberations shall not be made public until they shall have received the approbation of the Roman Pontiff." The acts of the Synod recently held at Maynooth have already been sent on to the Holy See, but of course they will be a secret until they have been confirmed in Rome and can be published in their final legislative form. So strictly bound to secrecy are those who are officially present at a Synod that even a Bishop who might be present by right but is absent through necessity cannot be informed of what passes in Synod. Such a case actually occurred at the First Provincial Synod of Westminster.¹ The Bishops of Liverpool and Nottingham were unable to be present. At the opening session Provost Croke, who was Procurator for the Bishop of Liverpool, asked if, in case he wanted to know the views of his Bishop on points discussed in the course of the Synod, he might communicate with him, and it was decided that he could not do so.

However, whilst officials must be silent, the officious will talk, and various conjectures are abroad. Some say that the recent Synod of Maynooth has made little or no changes on the decrees of the first Synod held there in 1875. Some say that there has been legislation

¹ See the Acts of the Synod, page 16.

with regard to the Christian Brothers; and on the strength of similar conjectures no persons in Ireland have been more exercised over the proceedings of the recent Synod than the Presentation Nuns and the Sisters of Mercy. Because officious persons, who always know more than officials, are quite certain that the Sisters of Mercy will have a Mother General, and that the Presentation Nuns will be taken from their present partial enclosure and will realize the original purpose of Nano Nagle. A very wise rule in the procedure of Synods is the decree *De Secreto Servando*; for the officious who of course should have been official if Canon Law were wise, would be sure to sit in judgment on the deliberations of the Bishops, and would make improved recommendations which would stand as a norma by which to test the wisdom of the Holy See.

Whatever be the final result of the recent Synod, its acts and decrees will be an index of the present needs and the general position of the Irish Church; for, being the outcome of the corporate jurisdiction of the Bishops, they must be made to meet the needs, not of a diocese or a province, but of all Ireland. In this connection it may be well to observe that the legislative power of a Plenary Synod is not the combined authority of the Bishops. It is something quite distinct, and for which a new element is necessary. If the Bishops of a country assemble and legislate on the strength of their united jurisdiction merely their legislation would resolve itself into so many diocesan decisions which would not have the canonical value even of a Diocesan Synod. Each Bishop, of course, brings his own jurisdiction with him into a Plenary Synod; else he would have no right to be there; but he also shares in the corporate jurisdiction which the Synod has, and in virtue of which alone it legislates. The new element which gives form to that jurisdiction comes from the Holy See. Formerly when Primates and Patriarchs had jurisdiction over Archbishops they could summon the Bishops of a nation into Plenary Synod and confirm its acts. But that jurisdiction is a thing of the past. In those times also the power of Princes was often in requisition. They were invited, and they thought it a privilege to lend the aid of the secular arm in sustaining the authority of Bishops and their Synodal decrees against erastian laics or schismatical churchmen. But the habit of intervening led them in the course of time to forget that theirs was an auxiliary part and a position of privilege; and when it suited their ambition they easily mistook fact for right, and though earthly kings, arrogated authority in a kingdom that is not of this world.

Metropolitans have not jurisdiction over one another, and therefore when the Primatial and Patriarchal jurisdiction in this matter ceased, the direct action of the Pope became necessary to convene

and confirm a National or Plenary Synod. But the Pope commissions one of the metropolitans to do so, who is therefore called an Apostolic Delegate, and holds jurisdiction as such for the purpose of the Synod only. The aid of kings is no longer available, and their pretended right to interfere is repudiated. Even the term "national" as applied to Plenary Synods has fallen into disfavor and almost into disuse, because of the color it might lend to those royal pretensions. Erastianism is but a pagan principle—*cujus est regio illius est religio*—revived by Christian Princes to gratify their greed of domination.

Thus it was as Delegate of the Holy See that Archbishop Kenrick presided over the first Plenary Synod of the United States held at Baltimore in 1852, that Archbishop Spalding presided over the second at Baltimore in 1866, and that Cardinal Gibbons presided over the third in 1884. By virtue of similar delegation Cardinal Moran presided over the two Plenary Synods of Australia at Sydney in 1885 and 1895. It was as Apostolic Delegate that Cardinal Cullen presided over the Plenary Synod at Thurles in 1850 and at Maynooth in 1875, and that Cardinal Logue presided over the Plenary Synod recently held at Maynooth. Whilst those Synods of the United States, Australia and Ireland are Plenary Synods, the Synods of Westminster presided over by Cardinal Wiseman in 1852, 1855 and 1859, and by Cardinal Manning in 1873, are but Provincial Synods, although all the Bishops of England were present at them. Cardinals Wiseman and Manning did not preside over them as Apostolic Delegates; there was no need of such delegation, and there was none. There is but one metropolitan in England, and he has the power as metropolitan to summon his suffragans, but the Synods summoned and presided over by him by virtue of his own jurisdiction could be and were only provincial.

The Archbishop of Dublin is Primate of Ireland; the Archbishop of Armagh is Primate of all Ireland. The latter takes precedence of the former and each takes precedence of the Archbishops of Cashel and Tuam; but in each case it is only a precedence of honor.

In the Pastorals issued by the Irish Bishops at the close of the Synod of Thurles they "announce the happy termination and gratifying results of the most solemn and important assembly that has been held by the Irish Church since the days of our glorious apostle, St. Patrick," and that "it will become an epoch in the history of our national church; an epoch which will not only be found pregnant with immediate benefits, but which will throw its directing light and influence on the future." The Fathers of the first Synod of Maynooth open their Pastoral with those words and add: "Twenty-five years have elapsed since these words were uttered; and although a

quarter of a century is but a brief moment in the life of the Church of God, *in whose sight a thousand years are as yesterday*, yet it has been long enough to furnish proof that these hopes have been abundantly fulfilled." The Pastoral just issued by the recent Synod opens thus: "As we contemplate the actual condition of the Church in Ireland, and its progress since the first Synod of Maynooth twenty-five years ago, we see on all sides manifest reasons for thanking God always for the grace that is given to you. For, whether we regard the Church's external organization or her living spirit—the outward forms in which her manifold activities show themselves, or the unfailing power of God's grace which as a living fountain wells up amongst her children unto eternal life—our hearts are filled with joy."

Those words allude to two elements in the Irish Church—the material manifestation of the people's faith and the living spirit within. "At other times and in other places there have been richer and grander churches than ours; but it has often happened that as the material building arose in strength and beauty, the spiritual edifice was crumbling into ruins. Thank God it has not been so in Ireland."

They have reason to thank God and to be proud of a people of whom they are able to say: "It is this spirit of faith that marks the singular harmony which exists in Ireland between the Church's growth in outward form and grandeur and her progress in the sanctity of her children." "The cowl does not make the monk" is applicable to a people as to a person. With many nations it would seem as if, when they had expended money and energy unsparingly in raising sanctuaries to God or in benevolent institutions where His charity is enshrined, they forgot the purpose for which they worked, gloried in their own goodness and finally slid from the spiritual life which had put forth its activity in such beautiful forms till little more of the Church of God remained but the shell, and of His worship "in spirit and in truth" only the shadow. It is quite otherwise in Ireland. The thatched chapel has disappeared and splendid buildings have been raised to replace them out of the poverty of the people, assisted largely by the generosity of their kinsfolk who have sought and found fortune in America. These temples stand out in their stateliness and architectural beauty as so many enduring symbols of the living faith of the people, quickened by trial into greater life and activity. "To those who observe us from the outside," as the Pastoral says, "these works seem but ill-proportioned to our poverty. And so they are." But the eye of faith that has designed them takes a wider and higher view of their purpose than that which mere political economy gives and which is

circumscribed by the narrow limits of the present life. But even from the economist's point of view they have been the occasion of distributing much money over the country. They have also stimulated Irish art, although not so much, I think, as might be. The architecture is, of course, entirely Irish; and so are the carving, painting and sculpture to a large extent. But these, too, should be all, or as nearly all as possible, the work of Irish artists. I am now considering it æsthetically rather than economically. I look onward to a time when those who are to come after us might study the genius and development of Irish art in the churches which we are building to-day. They cannot come to venerate if we do not build the shrines. The saints and the scenes from the Gospel are, of course, substantially the same whether represented by home or foreign art. But art is not as mere photography; it is colored according to the genius and the ideals of a people. In this sense it is that I should like to see transferred to canvas or wall or marble the sanctity of the imitators of Christ as assimilated by the ideals of Irish faith. Better work may come from abroad, and in exceptional cases it would be insular narrowness to set it aside. But in general our churches should be the homes and the shrines of a sacred art which we could call our own. The art of every people had to pass through a process of development. Every best begins at its worst; and if we wait till we are at our best we shall keep waiting forever. Cimabue and Giotto came before Fra Angelico, and if these had been disregarded for Greek models Italy to-day would present the absurdity of a naturalistic Christian art as represented by Titian and Benvenuto Cellini instead of the noble productions of the pre-Raphaelite painters; and the influence of those two schools of artists have been as divergent and far reaching as have been the literature created by Dante and Petrarch on the one hand and by Boccaccio on the other.

I have been speaking of the material manifestation of faith in Ireland. But the piety of the faithful of all classes and of both sexes has notably increased for the past fifty years. In the early part of the century men as a rule went but once or twice a year to the sacraments. That was not owing, in the vast majority of cases, to any want of faith. It was largely due to the customs in which they had been brought up. The Irish priests of those times were for the most part educated in France, and they brought home that spirit of rigorism which prevailed there. Moreover, the people were just coming out from under the cloud which had hung over them during the penal times. For generations they had to think less of how often they could go to the sacraments than whether they could venture to go at all. The people still point out in secluded glens all over the

country where Mass was offered up by stealth on rude stone altars with the heavens for a canopy. In a pamphlet published in 1884 Dr. Nulty, the late Bishop of Meath, says: "In my own boyhood I frequently heard old men glorying in the ingenuity of the stragem by which they were smuggled as merchandize in wagons covered with tarpaulins to the hiding place of the Bishop who confirmed them. They were conveyed back again as 'goods unsold' without exciting the suspicion of the authorities."

The following will illustrate how it fared with Catholics in Ireland even so late as the early years of the present century. An old priest who died a few years ago told me of a Protestant landlord in the County Limerick who used to send an order to the parish priest of the neighboring town in the harvest time to have the chapel cleared out and ready for the magnate's men to thrash his corn in it. The command was yielded to for a long time. But a new parish priest came, who was made of sterner stuff.² When the usual message was brought to him he sent back the following reply to the local despot: "Go back and tell your insolent master that if he dares to meddle with or desecrate my chapel I'll send him home with a sorer and a wiser head." The despot and his men came with the corn, but they did not thrash it. That process was in preparation for themselves. The priest was there to meet them at the head of a body of stalwart parishioners, and the desecrating despots prudently desisted. It must be said to the credit of the landlord that he duly appreciated the courage of the priest, and became his faithful friend for many years. In those times the Irish priest had in many cases no fixed residence, but depended on the hospitality of the people. To that state of things is to be traced the privilege which is peculiar to Ireland—that priests are still allowed to say Mass in the houses of their parishioners. Even the old custom of holding "stations" still remains in some parts of the country. That singular privilege of having Mass in private houses has been withdrawn in some dioceses. The Holy See would have prohibited it altogether, but owing to representations made by the Bishops that the faithful, born into the custom, would think it a great privation, it is tolerated. At present, I believe, permission has to be periodically renewed; and it is not improbable that the recent Synod has proposed to restrict the privilege still more. The custom is, of course, an unspeakable benefit, but it has its drawbacks also. Several other customs peculiar to Ireland have grown out of abnormal conditions brought about by the Penal laws. They grew out of the necessity of the times, and they lingered on after the necessity had passed away. Hence when we find defective baptismal and marriage registers, the

² That priest died as late as 1844.

absence of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in most country churches, and other liturgical shortcomings, it would not be fair to put them down to want of zeal on the part of the clergy or to want of piety on the part of the laity. The Rosary was the only form of public devotion which the people could always perform, and they have clung to it with a devout fidelity which is not to be found elsewhere in Christendom. In some country places the people assemble in the chapel before Mass on Sundays where some pious and intelligent man of the parish "gives out" the Rosary, and the others join in. There is hardly a Catholic family in Ireland in which the Rosary is not recited every night during Lent and Advent, and in most of them throughout the entire year. The Association of the Holy Family, introduced a few years ago by the Holy Father, has made a great revival of the Rosary devotion in Ireland.

Before the churches and their emoluments were confiscated a priest was present at the churchyard to perform the burial service at the grave. Then the churches and the churchyard passed under the control of the parson, and Catholic burial service was prohibited. The people solved the difficulty by taking some of the earth from the grave, often at a great distance, to have it blessed by the priest; they then take and scatter it on the grave before the coffin is lowered down into it; so that in spite of the law and without the ministrations of the parson the body of the deceased would be laid to rest in consecrated clay. That custom is kept up to the present day.

One can readily understand how priests who were brought up in such circumstances were glad to be let live at all, and did not always encourage sodalities and popular devotions such as we are used to at present. We now think them indispensable elements of spiritual life; if we had lived in Ireland in the days and circumstances of our fathers we might think otherwise. It must not be thought, however, that sodalities were unknown in Ireland till lately. I have in my possession some books of devotion specially compiled for the use of Sodalties of the Blessed Sacrament and other confraternities, printed in Dublin, Cork, Waterford or Limerick, in the early years of the century. I have heard of a poor old woman who died a few years ago at a great age, and who could sing the Latin hymns and recite the Latin psalms of Vespers from memory. She had learnt them in her early days in Limerick. But it is only within the present generation that popular devotions have spread to any great extent. There are few parishes in country or town where Sacred Heart Sodalties are not established. Even now the outside world is not aware of the extent to which they have grown. A great many practices of piety go on, and a good deal of spiritual activity is abroad all over the country which outsiders or passing visitors would never

suspect. Even converts to the Church are much more numerous than is generally known; not so numerous as elsewhere, because Protestantism in Ireland is a symbol of ascendancy; it means social privilege more than religious conviction, whilst Catholicism carries with it in their minds the tradition of inferiority and exclusion from the good things of this world. These spiritual activities are not so much advertised in Ireland as elsewhere; and let us hope that the Catholics of Ireland will always think it enough that God knows what they do in His honor without calling the attention of the world to look and admire them. Monthly confession and communion is a common practice with both sexes and amongst all classes; and those who neglect to do the Easter duty are very few. Intemperance, which was once so prevalent amongst all classes—in fact, was a tradition of extravagant respectability borrowed from the old gentry—has greatly decreased in the country parts and is less than it used to be in the cities. Working on holidays of obligation has become very common in late years; at the time of the first Synod of Maynooth it was very rare. We have been drawn into the ways and vices of the commercial world without sharing much of the benefits. We have let ourselves pass unconsciously through a process of Anglicization which many of us little dream of. The English “Reformers” thought that industry was retarded by the number of Catholic holidays; so Protestantism did away with them. In recent years they have come to think that the people had not holidays enough. They did not, however, revive the old holidays which they had done away with—that would be too much of an honor to Catholic saints—but they created new ones and called them “Bank holidays”—I suppose in honor of the God Mammon. Unfortunately the Catholics of Ireland have yielded, and have followed these changes in the humor of English Protestantism in this as in other things. It is to be hoped that the Gaelic revival will succeed in restoring these things, together with the mines of beautiful Catholic thought hidden away in the language which our Catholic fathers spoke.

The work which confronted the Bishops who assembled at the Plenary Synod of Thurles in 1850 was in some respects far more difficult than that which lay before the Bishops who assembled at Oscott and Baltimore in 1852. “In it for the first time,” says the Pastoral of the first Synod of Maynooth, “the Irish Church, at the issue of her three centuries of martyrdom, was enabled calmly to survey her own condition, to mark the wounds of which in the heat of the struggle she had hardly been conscious, and to replace in fair order, according to the Sacred Canons, the scattered stones of her sanctuaries. It was one of the first fruits of the blood of her count-

less Irish martyrs, who had sown in tears that we might reap in joy. It was held amid the prayers of an entire nation, chastened by heroic endurance of recent suffering. Its will was the unanimous voice of the entire body of the Irish Bishops, speaking with authority inherited through long lives of venerable predecessors, from the sainted founders of the ancient Episcopal Sees of the land. It was convoked in face of a great danger threatening the faith of the country, and in obedience to a special mandate from the Apostolic See in whose loving guidance all afflicted churches are sure to find 'defense and security, a haven where no waves swell, and a treasure of blessings innumerable.' The work of such a Synod was not meant in the designs of God to be transient, nor was its influence to perish as soon as its immediate objects were attained; but rather its spirit was long to survive, to be to the Irish Church an abiding source of vitality and strength in which, from time to time, her youth may be renewed as of an eagle."

For many years missions and retreats are given periodically in all the parishes of the country. The devotion of the *Quarant'ore* exists in the cities. Religious examinations are held annually in the schools of many of the dioceses. In all the cities and large towns the laity have branches of the St. Vincent de Paul Society for the relief of the poor. "Wakes," which were meant as a token of reverence for the dead and had become an abuse, are ceasing to be what they unfortunately too often were; and in some places they are gradually disappearing, as the custom is being introduced by the clergy of having the corpse taken to the church where that is practicable. The custom is also coming in of having marriages celebrated before Mass, at which the bride and bridegroom receive Holy Communion. I may here mention a remarkable illustration of the devotional tendency of the people which occurred within the past few months. A regiment of the Limerick county militia have been encamped in England during the South African war. They asked the local priest to direct a confraternity which they wished to form in the camp. He gladly consented, and every week several hundred of them assembled for devotions during their stay. That is a strong evidence, coming spontaneously from a body of men from whom such inspiration might be little expected.

A dozen pages or more of the Synodal Pastoral is taken up with the question of education in Ireland—primary, intermediate, university and technical. The Synod of Thurles and the first Synod of Maynooth were occupied with the same question, and we may, for a certainty, expect to find definite declarations of the Bishops on it amongst the decrees of the recent Synod. It looks like the final battleground on which anti-Catholicism seeks to try the faith of the

Irish people. "We are no longer assailed by open persecution and cruel edicts," wrote Cardinal Cullen in 1856,³ "but we have amongst us wolves in sheeps' clothing, lying in wait for the tender lambs of the fold. Confiscation of property, exile, the rack, the sword, so often employed against our fathers, are no longer spoken of. Education, charity, the Bible are now inscribed upon the banners of those whose bigotry and fanaticism in past days delighted in persecution and blood."

During the reign of Henry VIII. about 1,000 educational institutions were destroyed in Ireland. Out of confiscated Catholic property and public money were founded: The Parish School Act in 1537, Diocesan Free Schools in 1570, Trinity College in 1591, Royal Free Schools in 1605, Erasmus Smith Schools in 1669, The Blue Coat Schools in 1672—with the purpose of making the Irish, Protestant in faith and English in sympathy. By the 7th of William and Mary all Papists were prohibited from teaching school under heavy penalties; and the child who went abroad for education as well as the parent who sent him forfeited all their belongings. Henceforth arose the "hedge-schools,"

"Where the teacher and the pupil sat
Feloniously to learn."

Yet by 1730 the Protestant Primate Boulter wrote: "I can assure you the Papists are here so numerous that it highly concerns us, in point of interest, as well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures, who are our fellow-subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to the knowledge of the true religion; and one of the most likely methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for, instead of converting those that are adult, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to Popery." He suggested a new system known as "The Charter Schools," which began their work in 1734. In 1775 a by-law was made by which only "Popish children" were eligible for admission into them. In 1787 Howard, the philanthropist, caused a public inquiry to be made into their condition, which revealed lying reports on the part of those who controlled them and filth, neglect, immorality and ignorance on the part of the children who were to be enlightened out of the superstitions of Popery. After ninety-three years of existence they were finally swept away. But during that time they cost £1,600,000 sterling—all spent on not more than 12,000 children, and for such an "education" as Howard had exposed. In 1758 Catholics were allowed to open schools, and according to Mr. Wyse⁴ the Catholic priests by their own exertions and without any public money edu-

³ "Writings of Cardinal Cullen," Vol. I., page 418. ⁴ "History of the Catholic Association," Vol. II., page 92.
Vol. XXVI—Sig. 10.

cated each year four times as many as were "educated" by the Charter Schools at such enormous cost during the whole of their existence. He mentions that one priest in County Sligo established no less than thirteen schools, and adds that similar instances occurred elsewhere through the country.

The same anti-Catholic purpose established the Hibernian Military School in 1769, the Hibernian School in 1775, the Female Orphan School in 1790, the Association Against Vice in 1792, the London Hibernian Society in 1806, Kildare Street Schools in 1811, Institution for the Deaf and Dumb in 1819. Cardinal Cullen* gives a list of several other institutions founded with a view to the enlightenment of the Papists. But he points out that charity begins at home, and that the money thus wasted might be usefully spent in England. He quotes from a report signed by twenty Anglican Bishops: "The almost incredible degradation in morals as well as religion in which the masses of our people are sunk;" and from a Mr. Kay, of the University of Cambridge: "I speak it with sorrow and shame that our peasantry are more ignorant, more demoralized than those of any in Europe."

In 1831 the Government tried to mend their hand by the introduction of the "National School" system, of which Archbishop Whately, whilst openly declaring it an innocent system, privately expressed his confidence that it would "soon wean the Irish people from the errors of Popery." That system has been cobbled many times since it was established; each stage of improvement betraying the fact that the original purpose of the system is still inspiring and hampering the action of those who are responsible for it. In 1847 they established "model schools," to be examples of pedagogy for the ordinary National Schools. By the year 1867 these, about thirty in all, had cost £50,000, and they have been costing about £30,000 ever since. Though meant mainly for the supposed benefit of Catholics, hardly any Catholics go to them. I find, moreover, from Inspectors' returns that they are behind many of the National Schools in efficiency. The Royal Commission of 1869 condemned them as an utter failure; and the late Lord Randolph Churchill said that "they are the greatest imposture that could be kept up in Ireland."

The whole system on which educational opportunities have been offered to the Catholics of Ireland has been from the beginning a system of defiance and denial as long as that was possible, then of hypocrisy, deceit and cobbling. The history of the action of the English Government in this matter is such that they seem to have lost the faculty of framing an educational system for Irish Catholics

* loc. cit.

without slipping in some crank by which to twist the work of the machinery into proselytism. Little wonder that the Irish Bishops suspect whatever they offer, however denominational in appearance.

In the matter of higher education the Synod will probably have little to say that has not been said already in 1850 and 1875. For, in this, the Government has done little or nothing. They have an intermediate system by which Catholic youth are prepared for and encouraged to aspire to a university training, whilst they deny a university where the Catholic youth may go for it with safety to their faith.

The Pastoral also alludes to the establishment of a *Catholic Truth Society* for the dissemination of good literature amongst the people. It began its work last June, and in the five months which have since elapsed about fifty pamphlets have been issued and about half a million have been sold. It is an open secret that the Bishops have resolved also to establish a high-class weekly Catholic newspaper as an organ of Irish Catholic principles and interests.

Whilst the primary care of the Bishops is, of course, the spiritual and moral condition of their flocks, they have not forgotten in their Pastoral the temporal concerns of the country. It is a peculiarity of Irish ecclesiastical life that the temporal interests of the people enter largely into the cares of the priesthood. Irish history has decreed it so. The people were helpless in the past. They have been persecuted by open enemies, betrayed by pretending friends, and even many of their fellow-Catholics, once they had secured power and social position for themselves, troubled themselves little about their needs. The priest has been the only person to whom they could turn without suspicion. His disinterestedness has been tried by time, and therefore they expect his aid and sympathy in every trial.

M. O'RIORDAN.

Limerick, Ireland.

LEGAL TENURE OF THE ROMAN CATACOMBS.

THE mystery and system of concealment associated with the popular idea of the Roman Catacombs make it difficult at first to understand by what right or by what toleration Christians, before the conversion of Constantine, could have appropriated to themselves extensive tracts of land in the immediate neighborhood of Rome, conspicuously situated along the great highways that radiated from the imperial city. Twenty-six greater cemeteries are enumerated: three on the Appian Way, two on the Ardeatine,

one on the Ostian, one on the Portuensis, three on the Aurelian, one on the Flaminian, seven on the Old and New Salarian, one on the Nomentan, two on the Tiburtine, two on the Labicana and three on the Via Latina; besides nine minor cemeteries, all existing during the centuries of persecution; without taking into account six others constructed in the time of peace. How could the Christians possibly conceal their possession of this property, which they held for purposes of daily and public use? By no precautions could it be concealed that the bodies of thousands received burial in these tombs, and that relatives and friends accompanied them to their resting place, and periodically visited their graves. But concealment was not a universal fact, nor a necessary condition of secure tenure: to make this clear is the object of the present paper. The Roman laws which regulated the matter of interment amply protected, unless during times of popular excitement or exceptional legislation, the burial places of all citizens, without distinction of race or religion.

In order to understand the bearing of those laws on the tenure of property by Christians, it is necessary to define what legally constituted a sepulchre in the Roman code, and what conditions had to be satisfied to secure the inviolability of property once devoted to funeral rites. For this definition it may be useful first to describe the usual arrangements of a Roman tomb, and the connected buildings distributed over the piece of land belonging to it. We cannot do better than examine the ground plan of a noble sepulchral monument which has been preserved to us, and is now in the museum of Urbino. It is cut on a marble slab, and pagan as it is, was found in the catacomb of St. Helen on the Via Labicana, where it seems to have been utilized by the Christians to close the front of a *loculus*. Besides the exact survey made by the State of all the property of its citizens, Roman proprietors were accustomed to have the general outline and measurements of their land carved on stone and erected near the entrance. This was particularly the case with sepulchral ground; and along the Appian Way, and elsewhere near the remains of ancient tombs, stones are frequently found indicating the dimensions of the property: so many feet *in fronte*, of frontage, so many in depth, *in agro*. The Urbino marble is, however, much more descriptive; and although the proportions are not observed in the design, all the measurements are given in exact figures. The monument which it represents stood on the public road, probably the Labicana. The area surrounding the mausoleum is bounded on the right and at the back by a private road, 524 feet long in one direction, to a point where it turns and proceeds for 546 feet more, enclosing an area of ten *jugera*, or Roman acres. This private road joins a public one

which borders a continuation of the property for other 1,783 feet. The marble is broken, and the rest of the dimensions can only be guessed. At the lowest calculation the area between the extreme point of the 1783 feet boundary and the point of the plan where the marble is broken was at least two acres, giving twelve Roman acres as the minimum extent of this domain, consisting of two distinct parts.¹

The first, in which the mausoleum stands, is again divided into two parts: one, the *area* proper of the tomb on the public road, and the *area adjecta*, contiguous to the monument, immediately behind it. In the centre of the first was the tomb. We cannot say what was its form. It may have been a single chamber, a *cella memoriae*, dedicated to the memory of the deceased, containing his statue or his bust, and arranged with every convenience for the reception of his friends when they came to commemorate him according to custom. It may have been constructed, like so many tombs on the Via Latina, in two stories: the lower, the hypogeum, to contain the urn or sarcophagus, lighted by a lamp; and the other, above, a chamber for the assembly of those who came to recall the memory of the departed. It may have been covered with tiles, or a roof formed with a flat terrace and trellis, *pergula*, where the guests sat in the open air. Of its decoration, its statues, its portico we can say nothing.

The enclosure round the principal building contained at its two extremities dependences which served to lodge the custodian, the gardeners and workmen who looked after the place, a pantry, a cellar, a kitchen, a well and other outhouses. In these dependences alone was it lawful for any one to live. It was sacrilege to make one's dwelling in the tomb itself, in the triclinium, above or against the tomb; and this crime or *piaculum*, was punished by hard labor or banishment. After the burning of Rome by Nero it is recorded that the populace took shelter in the tombs; and fugitives from justice sometimes made them their refuge: but this was exceptional, for it was severely forbidden by the laws to defile by the presence of the living the dwelling place of the Manes.

At the left side of the monument the plan shows a smaller rectangle, also divided into two portions, one facing the public road, the other immediately behind; giving us in smaller proportion the distribution of the larger property. The *area monumenti* in front and the *area adjecta*, or *agellus conclusus* behind. This is an example of those allotments of ground that were frequently made *ex indulgentia*, out of the benevolence of the great proprietor, either by cession or sale to poorer citizens for family sepulchral areas.

To return to the main plan. The first area, the court of honor or

¹ For a reproduction of this plan and a detached description see De Kossi, *Roma Sotter.* I., Appendix at the end of the volume, pp. 55 sqq.

forum of the sepulchre, as Cicero calls it (*De Leg. ii.*, 24), was walled about, and on three sides enclosed by a portico. Behind this was the *area adjecta*, called also *hortus*, *hortulus*, *pomarium*, planted with trees and flowers, and intersected by avenues. In the rear of this a private road separated the principal portion of the domain from the remainder of the *area adjecta*, the adjoining land, which *cedit monumento*, goes with the monument. This is an instance of the jealousy with which the right of way was guarded by the Romans, when interference with it prevented free access to their places of burial. Cicero reproaches a freedman of Sylla because after usurping land of Roscius Amerinus he would not allow him to pass freely to visit his father's tomb, which was on the confiscated property. In later times a Rescript of Antoninus Pius imposed on proprietors whose land bordered the area of a sepulchre a servitude of right of way in favor of the owners of the tomb, fixing an indemnity in return.

Beyond the private road the land *cedens monumento* spreads to a considerable distance, and is devoted to ordinary cultivation, while the inner *area adjecta* is reserved for ornamental trees, orchard produce and flower gardens: and the immediate court of the sepulchre was left uncultivated as the law prescribed.

In the plan, one side of the most distant area is separated from the public road by a strip of land, portioned off into rectangular divisions of unequal size, indicated by a number of *cippi*, or land marks. This furnishes us with another example of allotments made to poorer citizens for burial places, out of the land of the larger proprietors, and is perhaps the most remarkable demonstration of the custom, which made it easy for the Christians to profit by the dispositions of the Roman law to acquire ground for the excavation of their cemeteries.

Now that we have seen with the help of the Urbino marble the material arrangement of a Roman place of burial, we are enabled to understand something of the uses to which the various buildings were put, and of the system of administration under which the whole was kept, as these are described in another ancient document. This is a copy of a Roman will in which the testator gives directions for the construction of his tomb, and provides for its preservation and for the ritual and family commemorations to be observed after his death. This will was discovered on a parchment in the Library of Basle, in 1863, and is a copy of what had been inscribed in marble on a Roman tomb at Langres in Gaul. The transcript is not entire, but the fragment is of the greatest importance, throwing light, as it does, on the funeral usages of the Romans and on the facility with which the Christians, under cover of the prevailing customs, could substitute for the profane observances of the heathen their own rites, with-

out attracting attention, and remain in undisturbed possession of their cemeteries.²

The name of the testator is lost. However, it is apparent that he was a Gallo-Roman, an inhabitant of Langres; and to judge from his equipages, his furniture and garments which were to be burned with him, must have lived sumptuously. His dispositions show us what a rich Roman of the second or third century meant by a tomb. The fragment begins with instructions to his heirs to finish the monument which he had commenced for himself. He directs the *cella memoriae* to be completed according to the designs he has left. This *cella* is to have an exedra, or semi-circular chamber, with two seated statues of the deceased, one of marble, the other of bronze; a couch and two marble chairs and is to be provided with carpets to be spread on the seats, with covers and cushions, and a supply of banqueting garments for the guests on the days when the *cella* was to be open for their feasts. In front of the *cella* and exedra an *ara* was to be erected to contain his bones. A gate of marble, opening and shutting, was to close the entrance. The land surrounding this edifice is to be laid out as an orchard, *pomarium*. Three gardeners, *topiarii*, are to be retained at a salary which he fixes at sixty measures of corn, besides thirty measures for their clothing. He orders the names of the magistrates who were in office when the mausoleum was begun to be inscribed on the outside, as well as his own age at the time of his death. Then follow penalties on his heirs if they suffer any bodies to be burned, interred or otherwise introduced into the ground set apart for his tomb, excepting the bodies of such persons as he himself may have designated. The land is declared inalienable, and the possession of the heirs is limited to its custody, its maintenance and repair. Finally he ordains that all freedmen and freedwomen enfranchised by him are to make every year a contribution to defray the cost of the funeral feast on his anniversary, and to choose each year curators to collect the *stipes*, and to offer the customary sacrifices on the *ara* of the tomb, on the first days of April, May, June, July, August, September and October.³

Burial places like the two described in the Urbino marble, and the Basle will, could be quite legally held by Christians, either in their individual names or as a corporation. This is the next step in the consideration of the matter before us. No law prevented them from holding property, although in common with other citizens they were debarred from devoting to burial purposes land within the city walls. But outside the walls, in the suburbs, and in the country, they were at liberty to set apart a portion of land for the burial place of themselves, their families and their friends or others admitted to share the

² De Rossi, "Bullettino," Aprile, 1864. ³ Id. Dicembre, 1863, where the text of the Will is given.

privilege. Like all subjects of the Empire, they were free to bury their dead outside the city, in their villas, their fields or their gardens. Land once allotted to this purpose came to be held under the usual legal conditions of every place of interment.

Roman law divided property in land into *locus purus*, simple proprietorship, and *locus sacer, sanctus, religiosus*, sacred, holy, religious, three degrees or shades of dedication which separated property so distinguished from ordinary property not set apart for any religious or semi-religious use. Only the first division, *locus purus*, simple or ordinary unfettered property could be bought and sold, and be transferred from hand to hand. The three classes of the second division could not be commercially treated, nor diverted from the purpose to which they had been dedicated. They were regarded as *divini juris*, of divine right, and what is of divine right is the particular property of no one.⁴ A sacred place, *locus sacer*, was a place consecrated by certain religious ceremonies to the worship of the superior divinities: a holy place, *locus sanctus*, a place protected against invasion and encroachment by peculiar sanction of the law: a religious place, *locus religiosus*, one given over to the Manes or inferior gods. Any place where a dead body was deposited became a *locus religiosus* on certain conditions depending some on the laws of the Pontiffs and guarded by them, some on the ordinary civil law. By the pontifical law a tomb became a religious place only when there was *justa sepultura*—that is, when the body was formally consigned to the earth, *inhumatum*. When towards the end of the republic cremation became general the law was evaded. The ritual of interment and the new practice were reconciled by mingling some earth with the ashes placed in the urn, or burying in the earth a fragment of bone which had escaped the fire. The condition required by the civil law was one only: that the ground to which the body was committed was the free property of the person ordering the interment: consequently a grave did not become a religious place, if it was dug in a field belonging to another, or let to another, or subject to some servitude which the legal consequences of a regular interment would frustrate.

This condition of the law was entirely in favor of the Christians. They abhorred cremation, interment was the only funeral rite they practiced. It is true that they rejected the worship of the Manes, as they rejected all idolatry. But the law did not require the formal dedication of the grave to the Dii Manes, and was perfectly indifferent to the creed professed by the deceased or his friends: the sole fact of the interment, with the prescribed conditions, gave the religious character to the tomb.

⁴ De Rossi, *Roma Sotter.* I., p. 101.

In one particular, however, Christians were at a disadvantage, although this was more apparent than real. The religious character attached itself simply to the tomb itself, the rest of the land, gardens, parks, dependent buildings did not share the privilege. A field entirely occupied by graves might be regarded as wholly religious and inalienable; but a field containing a single tomb was liable to be sold, with the exception of the limited area of the grave itself. The pagan had a means of extending the protection of the privilege to the whole of the land; he could invite the Pontiffs to consecrate it to one of the superior gods, Diana, Cybele, Venus, Fortune, for example, making it a *locus sacer*; or to the inferior gods, making it *locus religiosus*. This involved the use of idolatrous rites, and the Faithful were debarred from it. But it does not appear that the pagans themselves had frequent recourse to this method of securing the inviolability of their burial domains. The reason may have been that the ceremonies were complicated and probably expensive, and because there was a much simpler and equally efficacious way of arriving at the same end. And this was quite as much in the power of the Christians as of the pagans. It was sufficient to insert in the deed of gift, or in the will of the founder, a clause restraining from alienating any of the land annexed to the tomb, under penalty of a fine to be paid to the Treasury, or the Pontiffs, or the College of Vestals.

The Roman legislation therefore protected the inviolable character of land once devoted to purposes of burial, without distinction of religion; did it also secure to Christians immunity from what they would have regarded a sacrilegious profanation, the intrusion of bodies of aliens into their burial places? We know how firm they were on this point. A certain Martialis, who had buried his children among pagans, was for that alone considered an apostate from the Church. The law was here again in their favor, and furnished them with legal means of preventing it. Two kinds of sepulchres were recognized by the law: one which passed from the founder to his heir, becoming the property of the heir after the death of the founder, inalienable as a religious place, but transmissible to other heir; the other was the family sepulchre, which did not become the property of the heir, nor could he dispose of it in any fashion. "*Hoc monumentum hæredem ne sequatur*" is an inscription frequently met with. In such a sepulchre the founder had a place by right, with the members of his family, and others who, by enfranchisement, bore the family name. The heir, too, might be buried in the family tomb, but had no right to place in it any of his own family or pass it on to others. The founder, or testator, had even the power to exclude whom he pleased in the classes ordinarily admitted to share the

family tomb. In this way Christians were enabled to protect their cemeteries from promiscuous burials, and we have evidence in several epitaphs that they availed themselves of their legal faculty to allow the use of their tombs to others, provided they were brethren in the faith.⁵

With a knowledge of the material and legal conditions which regulated the burial places of the Romans, it is easy to understand how the common law completely protected the tombs of Christians, in the ordinary cases of a private *cella memoria*, and its dependences, erected by a proprietor in his own grounds. In the example of a wealthy Roman's funeral domain, exhibited in the Urbino plan, we have not only the vast area of the principal owner, but smaller areas of various extent, all devoted to places of burial. The extent of similar enclosures varied to any size, from squares of twelve or sixteen feet to vast tenements and real parks, according to the wealth and inclination of the proprietor, necessarily limited, along the fashionable high-ways, where land was valuable and quickly bought up.

A Christian had the same right as another citizen to inter his dead in land of his own: the land became at once religious: he could share his tomb with whom he pleased, and exclude whom he pleased. He could provide for its custody, for the decorous observance of anniversaries and for the assemblies of friends or relations in the *cella memoria* or the triclinium: he could dispose of funds to defray all the expenses of its maintenance in proper order and fix, if he thought well, a yearly contribution from all admitted to its benefits. In reality this is the first origin of the Christian catacombs of Rome. The earliest denomination given to a catacomb is the name of its founder, a rich noble, or a pious matron; and the same names have come down to us as the original owners of the land where the catacomb was excavated. Thus we have the *prædia*, or farms, of Lucina, of Flavia Domitilla, of the Cæcili, of Prætextatus, of Pudens, of Cyriaca, the Ostrianum; the little field, *agellum*, the property of St. Agnes where she herself was laid; the *hortus*, gardens of Justus and Theon, all in Rome; and out of Rome, the *aræ* of Macrobius, of Evelpius, etc., in Africa.

A classic example of this origin of a historic catacomb is offered in the primitive portion of what is called the Catacomb of Callixtus—the Cemetery of Lucina on the Appian Way. An area with a frontage of a hundred feet and a depth back from the road of two hundred and thirty feet, encloses what still remains of a massive quadrangular tomb now stripped of every inscription and ornament. It has been made out with almost absolute certainty that this tomb belonged to the family of a lady, whose Christian agnomen has alone been pre-

⁵ *Id.*, p. 109.

served, but who was a descendant of the Cæcili or of the Corneliæ Æmili—perhaps that celebrated Pomponia Græcina whose conversion to the Christian faith, and trial by her husband are described by Tacitus.* The prædium, like the subject of the Urbino marble, was divided into two parts, the area proper, or court of the tomb, occupying the full frontage and extending back from the public way fifty feet, leaving a hundred and eighty feet of area adjecta reaching to the extreme boundary of the plot. In this second portion, more remote from the road, and behind the principal monument, Lucina, or one of her descendants, constructed a hypogeum, or crypt, for her Christian relatives and her brethren in the faith, with an ample staircase and ornamental doorway leading to the subterranean. The field over this crypt was planted, perhaps, as we see it to-day. At a later period another Lucina, probably a descendant of the first, during the persecution of Gallus, interred the Martyr Pope Cornelius almost at the foundations of the ancient family monument. This cemetery of Lucina is the most remarkable type of a private burial place in its transition from its strictly family character to its incorporation in the public property of the Church. Nearly all the Roman catacombs began in the same way. Around the tomb of the patron, "ex indulgentia patroni," as the pagan inscriptions say, graves were opened for the less wealthy members of the community, just as encircling the tomb of the rich heathen, his slaves, his freedmen and his clients found a resting place.

The Christians adhered to the system of private tenure of their property in individual names as long as they could. It was safe and suited their purpose as long as the cemetery remained within moderate limits, and its cost of management did not overtax the resources of the owner. When the graves were few the proprietor and his army of servants were sufficient for the work of the cemetery; but although the system of construction permitted level under level to be excavated, the enormous numbers that had to be buried soon exceeded the resources of the place, and the owner retired from the responsibility, which was assumed by the society for whose benefit the cemetery had been hitherto administered. So the growth of the Christian population, and the force of circumstances led to the introduction of another system, that of corporate tenure, and management under the immediate control of the ecclesiastical authorities.

It may seem extravagant to speak of corporate tenure and of possessions of the Church as an established and recognized body in the reigns of Decius, and Valerian, and Diocletian; but there is no doubt left on the point, and the evidence is both abundant and conclusive.

* "Dublin Review," April.

Promiscuous burial was hateful to pagan as well as Christian. No Roman would be buried among strangers, he must be buried among relations, friends, or persons associated to him by some common bond. Hence arose numerous burial societies or clubs, composed of members of a common trade, natives of the same province, inhabitants of the same city district. They had each a schola, or meeting place for celebrations and repasts, they bore the expense of a funeral and a tomb for their members. They took various titles, as Worshipers of Jupiter, of Hercules, of Diana, of Silvanus; sometimes a mysterious name, as "Companions who feast together;" or took a name from their founder, as the Syncrations, the Pelagians, etc. Funeral clubs were lawful in Rome from the first century by a decree of the Senate. A special permission was required in the provinces. Towards the end of the second century this restriction was removed, and a rescript of Alexander Severus sanctioned their erection under certain conditions. Up till that time Augustus' system of diffidence directed the imperial policy, but circumstances favored a change. The old aristocracy, decayed or decimated, was replaced by a new nobility without prestige or traditions; the ties between patron and client were relaxed or broken. The lower classes were beginning to rely on themselves and unite for common interests.

There were poor guilds and wealthy ones. Indeed the law at first was in favor of the poor, who were allowed to club freely together to provide a decent funeral, but they were forbidden to hold general meetings more than once a month. These less wealthy guilds purchased a columbarium with money given by a benefactor, or collected by subscription among the associates. Other clubs received gifts and bequests of land or money, on condition of rendering funeral honors to the donor and making the customary sacrifices on the anniversary of his birth and of his death, and the offerings of violets, roses and grapes, according to the season.

It was under the semblance of benevolent associations for mutual help, and with the legal protection enjoyed by burial clubs, that the Christians first began to hold in a collective name their cemeterial property. It is in the third century that we have for the first time mention of cemeteries belonging to them as a body; and it was heard in the angry cry of the pagan mobs in Africa: "*Areæ Christianorum non sint*," Down with the cemeteries of the Christians. The Church in Rome could not have been behind the Church in the province, and accordingly it is about the same time that the earliest document registering the corporate possession of the catacombs appears. It was just the period when the Church first stood out as a regularly organized institution, and was brought prominently into

public notice by its activity and influence on society. Now it was not only the conscience of individuals that revealed itself in particular facts, but the society itself manifesting its vitality in organized and corporate action. The first communities had no need to possess land, their richer co-religionists supplied what was required; but with growth and expansion it became necessary to secure by other means the decent burial of their dead. It was also the period when funeral clubs had reached their greatest development throughout the Empire. The unknown author of the *Philosophumena*, a work of the third century, tells us that Pope Zephyrinus, as soon as he succeeded Victor in the Papal chair, gave to the Archdeacon Callixtus charge of The cemetery. The cemetery antonomastically named was the one now known by the name of the Archdeacon. In that office he had already charge of the Church's treasury. Why was this particular cemetery on the Appian Way selected to be the special charge of the chief official in Rome under the Pope? The cemetery up to this time held in greatest veneration was the one excavated under the Vatican Hill; there the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul had attracted round them all the Popes previous to Zephyrinus. The extension of the circus of Nero had disturbed their repose and occasioned their translation to the third mile on the Appian Way, where the basilica of St. Sebastian stands, a place called *ad catacumbas*. Why was Callixtus not set over the cemetery which contained this precious deposit, but over the cemetery a mile nearer Rome? The reason was because this was the first great official cemetery legally constituted as a possession of the Roman Church, to be administered by its official, the Archdeacon. Doubtless the protection and favor of the noble families who granted the land, contributed to the preference. Whatever may have been the motive of the choice, the fact is established that the cemetery of Calixtus was in the third century the property of the Christians as a corporation.

The appointment of Callixtus to this important office was made with great discrimination. He had been a man of the world, a business man, we should say, accustomed to the responsibilities of extensive management, young with all his experience, active and energetic. Admitted to orders, he gained the full confidence of the Pope and was charged with the immediate direction of the clergy. The cemetery confided to him was composed of crypts constructed by the Cæcili in their land, and made over to the Church. In his management of it he left us evidence of extraordinary activity, opening new galleries, constructing cubacula and directing their decoration with true artistic taste combined with exquisite religious sentiment. From that time the cemetery of Callixtus was the ordinary burial

place of the Popes till peace was given to the Church by Constantine.

Callixtus was at the same time manager of all the temporal affairs of the Roman Church; the support of the clergy, the maintenance of the places of assembly, the assistance of the poor, the administration of the common fund, all centred in him as the recognized representative of the Body Corporate in the face of the public authorities and institutions of the State. We do not mean to say by this that at the end of the second century, or in the third, the Church was recognized as a corporate body with a religious character. What is meant is that association among Christians was permitted; that they, like the rest of the citizens, were free to form civil *collegia*, and did actually unite in such associations, whose legal status was acknowledged, while their religious character escaped notice, or was dissembled under the appearance of Benefit Societies.

We have seen how the poorer guilds were authorized to collect a monthly contribution from the members; and we find the counterpart of this among the Christians. Tertullian informs us that the Christians had an arca, or coffer, "into which the faithful once a month, or when they could and as they could, put their mite for the support of the indigent and their burial when dead."[†] We also know that, besides the distribution of money, gifts in kind were given away by the profane corporations in their reunions, where after the repast in common a sum of money, or a *sportula*, small basket of provisions, was given to each of the guests in proportion to their condition and need. Precisely the same usage was observed in the assemblies of the Christians, where, besides the poor, the clergy and others who were deserving received money or a *sportula*, according to their rank and condition. It was therefore a simple matter for the Church to take advantage of the legislation on funeral guilds to have itself incorporated under their form. The presence of many wealthy members in the community was no obstacle to the formation of the society, because in all guilds the *tenuiores*, more indigent members, were always glad to affiliate as honorary members or as benefactors persons of distinguished rank and position, so that in the guilds as in the city itself there was always to be distinguished the *plebs* from the *patroni*.

Is it possible now to say what was the legal designation of the corporate association of Christians? There is a certain amount of material to lead to a conclusion, but sufficient proof to answer the question in the affirmative is wanting. The material is derived from a series of inscriptions. First of all there is one discovered in Africa,

[†] Modicum unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel cum velit, et si modo possit, apponit, * * * egenis alendis humanisque (Tertullian. Apolog. c: xxxix.)

at Cæsarea in Mauritania, which records that a certain Evelpius, *Cultor Verbi*, a worshiper of the Word, gave an area for a place of burial, and built a chapel, *cella*, at his own expense, leaving this memorial to Holy Church. The slab was restored some time later, and the following inscription added: "Ecclesia Fratrum hunc restituit titulum." The Church of the Brethren restored this monument. The singular phrase, *cultor Verbi*, is parallel to what is met with in the designations of the pagan guilds: *Cultores Jovis, Herculis, Dianæ, Silvanæ*, etc. But "the Brethren" is repeatedly found in inscriptions of the same period. One monument was erected to the memory of "all who lie in this place of rest, by me, Victor the priest, who prepared it for all the brethren." Another was found in Phrygia, to the memory of five persons who purchased the grave together, ending with the notice: "Up to this stella the eastern portion of the area is common to all the Brethren." In Heraclea, in Pontus, an inscription imposes a fine of 300 denarii to be paid into the coffer of the "Brethren" by any one who introduces another body into a certain tomb. At Salona the fine was to be paid to the "Church of Salona." Finally in Rome, in the Kircherian museum, an epitaph says: "I beseech you, good brethren, by the One God, not to disturb this monument after my death."

The conclusion which De Rossi draws not as certain, but as highly probable, is that the members of the Christian guilds called themselves "Fratres" Brethren, and that the legal denomination of the Christian corporate associations was "Ecclesia Fratrum," the Church of the Brethren. This is plainly implied in the words of a Christian apologist, writing to pagans: "You are jealous of the name of Brothers which we call ourselves, as children of one Father, God, and heirs of the same hope."

Whatever may have been the legal denomination of the Christian corporations, it is beyond all doubt that in the third century the Church, either by the toleration of the Emperors or by some legal contrivance eluding prohibitive laws, held possession of churches and cemeteries; and that this possession was formally recognized by the Emperors, sometimes intervening with their authority to protect them, sometimes decreeing the confiscation of their corporate property and sometimes restoring it to the management of the Church. The confiscations did not suppose the tenure illegal or the possession of property a violation of law, or abusive; but rather supposed it to be a right which for motives of policy or caprice was to be abolished or suspended. Alexander Severus not only encouraged corporations of artisans, but not content with the passive toleration of his predecessors with regard to Christians, issued an edict forbidding them to be troubled: "Christianos esse non læsit." He himself

decided a suit between the *popinari*, victuallers, and the Christians in favor of the latter, treating both societies as equally entitled to plead in a corporate quality. The same Emperor confirmed the Christians in possession of their meeting place on the other side of the Tiber; and what is more singular, the Christians of Antioch had recourse to the Emperor Aurelian to have the heretic Paul of Samosata expelled from "the house of the Church," after he had been canonically deprived of his see.

Availing himself of the mild reigns of Severus and the two Philips, Pope Fabius divided the superintendence of the cemeteries among the seven deacons and ordered many constructions on the cemeterial land, *cellæ* and *memoriæ* above ground, and basilicas. He was martyred in 250 under Decius. An edict of Valerian of the year 257 forbade the use of the cemeteries. All visits to them and meetings were prohibited. The places for religious assembly, as distinct from the cemeteries, were confiscated and sold for the benefit of the State. This edict was revoked three years later by Gallienus, who ordered the restitution of the places of religious meeting to the Bishops of the various churches, directing special rescripts to the provinces. The edicts of Aurelian against the Church, issued shortly after he had legally recognized it, and sanctioned its possession of property even more formally than Alexander Severus, gave the Christians the measure of security they could depend on as soon as the new society became considerable enough to attract attention. It was then that the system of concealment began. The ordinary entrances to the cemeteries were closed, the staircases interrupted, the galleries obstructed when they led to tombs where the more cherished martyrs reposed: circuitous passages were excavated leading to remote large chambers, where the religious offices were held; mysterious outlets were contrived connected with arenaria or sandpits through which communication with the open air was possible without causing suspicion; everything was done to protect the inviolability of the graves and provide for the safety of the living who either for devotion or for temporary shelter betook themselves to the catacombs.

That the cemeteries were places of meeting and prayer, though by no means the only ones, is attested by writers of the times of persecution, as Tertullian, the author of the "*Philosophumena*," of "*The Life of Pope Fabius*," the letters of St. Cyprian and the edicts of the Emperors, interdicting or restoring their use. The interment of a Christian was itself a religious rite; the body was reverently washed, anointed and separately laid in the ground, with psalms and canticles, and the oblation of the Holy Sacrifice; the anniversary of the death or deposition was carefully observed, and with special solemnity in the case of martyrs; all this from faith in the resurrection.

The crypts that kept these venerable deposits drew crowds when the *dies natalis* returned, and became true sanctuaries, where the marble slab that covered the precious remains served at one and the same time for the Table of the Christ's Sacrament and the faithful custodian of His martyr's bones. No wonder that, when danger drove the faithful from the tituli in the city they found it no hardship to worship in these subterranean basilicas, surrounded by those they had loved on earth, revered in death, with whom they were still joined in communion, as they hoped to be united in sharing their crown.

Just in this second half of the third century Pope Sixtus II. is discovered in the cemetery of Prætextatus presiding at an ordination of clergy, taken and beheaded in his episcopal chair; St. Emerentiana, still a catechumen, praying at the tomb of her foster-sister Agnes, martyred a few days before, received the baptism of her blood, stoned to death; St. Candida cast down a luminare and overwhelmed with stones. It was during the reign of Valerian that Hippolytus lived in hiding on the Appian Way and instructed neophytes in the catacomb, where with many companions and the repentant traitor who betrayed them he suffered martyrdom. Under the same Emperor, or under Numerian, the martyrs Chrysanthus and Daria were slain in an arenarium, and shortly after, during the celebration of the sacred mysteries at their tomb, the persecutors came upon a multitude of the faithful assembled, and casting stones and earth from above, buried them alive. Long after, St. Gregory of Tours visited the spot, and through the protecting bars of a grating saw the remains of the martyred congregation lying, as they fell, with the sacred vessels scattered on the ground.

The second half of the third century passed in a succession of intervals of toleration and persecution. Dionysius the successor of Sixtus II., recovered the *Tituli* in Rome, as well as the cemeteries in the suburbs, and redistributed them among the clergy, assigning to each Titulus or parish its particular cemetery; the deacons having the temporal administration, the priests the spiritual jurisdiction over both. Even Diocletian, at the beginning of his reign, so encouraged by his toleration the confidence of the Christians, that they went on building and extending the cemeteries. To this period many of the staircases, light shafts and other constructions in masonry throughout the catacombs seem to belong. In the cemetery of Callixtus there is a large double chamber, well lighted and once lavishly decorated, built, as an inscription still preserved testifies, in the Pontificate of Marcellinus, by the deacon Severus.

In 303 toleration changed into fierce hostility. The churches were burned, the records destroyed, the *cellæ* at the cemeteries demolished. Vol. XXVI.—Sig. 11.

ished and the land over the cemeteries confiscated. In this time of danger Priscilla the younger excavated the lowest and most hidden galleries of the catacomb called by her name on the Salarian Way.

The persecution ended in 306, but it was not till 311 that restitution was made to Pope Melchiades as the recognized chief of the Christian community, a proof that the confiscated property was acknowledged to be a corporate possession, and not of individuals. The Tituli restored were twenty-five, and to each corresponded a cemetery, or a region of a cemetery. That this was all regarded as corporate property is made still more clear by text of the decree of Constantine and Licinius: "The Christians are known to have possessed property which belonged to them as a body, that is, to their churches, not to individuals."⁸

From this date the possession of the catacombs was never questioned. In them and over them additions were made, chiefly during the century and a half in which they continued to be used as burial places; but the decoration of particular tombs and the opening of more convenient approaches continued till the ninth century, when the bodies of the great bulk of the martyrs were transferred to the city churches.

Enough has been said to establish that during the three hundred years of persecution Christians were free to bury their dead in land of their own; that at the beginning the land was the property of rich families, who allowed graves to be opened for the poor of their faith; that later under the form of burial associations they could combine to hold their cemeteries in collegiate name, and that, finally, the Church, as a corporate body (whether as the "*Ecclesia Fratrum*" or under another designation), came to be recognized before the Roman law as the responsible owner of the cemeteries and of all the edifices erected on the land in which they were excavated.

J. A. CAMPBELL.

Rome, Italy.

⁸ Et quoniam iidem Christiani non loca tantum, ad quae convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur, ad jus corporis eorum, id est, Ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum, pertinentia; ea omnia lege qua superius, comprehendimus, citra ullam prorsus ambiguitatem vel controversiam iidem Christianis, id est, corpori et conventiculis eorum reddi jubebis, etc. (Lactantius, *De mort. persecutorum*, xlviii.)

DE IESV CHRISTO REDEMPTORE.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS, PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS,
ARCHIEPISCOPIS, EPISCOPIS ALIISQUE LOCORUM OR-
DINARIIS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM
APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDIC-
TIONEM.

TAMETSI futura prospicientibus, vacuo a sollicitudine animo esse non licet, immo vero non paucae sunt nec leves extimescendae formidines, cum tot tamque inveteratae malorum caussae et privatim et publice insideant: tamen spei ac solatii aliquid videntur haec extrema saeculi divino munere peperisse. Nemo enim existimet, nihil habere ad communem salutem momenti renovatam cogitationem bonorum animi, fideique et pietatis christianae excitata studia: quas quidem virtutes revirescere apud complures aut corroborari hoc tempore, satis expressa signa testantur. En quippe in medio illecebrarum saeculi ac tot circumiectis pietati offensionibus, tamen uno nutu Pontificis undique commeare Romam ad limina sanctorum Apostolorum multitudo frequens: cives pariter ac peregrini dare palam religioni operam: oblataque Ecclesiae indulgentiâ confisi, parandae aeternae salutis artes studiosius exquirere. Quem praeterea ista non moveat, quae omnium obversatur oculis, erga humani generis Salvatorem solito magis incensa pietas? Optimis rei christianae temporibus facile dignus iudicabitur iste ardor animi tot hominum millium una voluntate sententiaque ab ortu ad solis occasum consalutantium nomen laudesque praedicantium Iesu Christi. Atque utinam istas avitae religionis velut erumpentes flammam magnum incendium consequatur: exemplumque excellens multorum reliquos permoveat universos. Quid enim tam huic aetati necessarium, quam reintegrari late in civitatibus indolem christianam, virtutesque veteres? Illud calamitosum, alios et quidem nimis multos obsurgere, nec ea, quae ab eiusmodi pietatis renovatione monentur, audire. Qui tamen si "scirent donum Dei," si reputarent, nihil fieri posse miserius quam descivisse a liberatore orbis terrarum, moresque et instituta christiana deseruisse, utique exsuscitarent et ipsi sese, certissimumque interitum effugere converso itinere properarent.—Iamvero tueri in terris atque amplificare imperium Filii Dei, divinatorumque beneficiorum communicatione ut homines salvi sint contendere, munus est Ecclesiae ita magnum

atque ita suum, ut hoc in opere maxime omnis eius auctoritas ac potestas consistat. Id Nos in administratione Pontificatus maximi, perdifficili illa quidem ac plena curarum, videmur ad hunc diem pro viribus studuisse: vobis autem, venerabiles Fratres, usitatum certe est, immo quotidianum, praecipuas cogitationes vigiliasque in eodem negotio Nobiscum consumere. Verum utrique debemus pro conditione temporum etiam maiora conari, nominatimque per sacri opportunitatem Anni disseminare latius notitiam atque amorem Iesu Christi, docendo, suadendo, hortando, si forte exaudiri vox nostra queat, non tam eis, dicimus, qui effata christiana accipere pronis auribus consuevere, quam ceteris omnibus longe miserrimis, christianum retinentibus nomen, vitam sine fide, sine amore Christi agitantibus. Horum Nos maxime miseret: hos nominatim velimus, et quid agant et quorsum evasuri sint, ni respicerint, attendere.

Iesum Christum nullo unquam tempore nullaque ratione novisse, summa infelicitas est, vacat tamen pervicacia atque ingrati animi vitio: repudiare aut oblivisci iam cognitum, id vero scelus est adeo tetrum atque insanum, ut in hominem cadere vix posse videatur. Principium enim atque origo ille est omnium bonorum: humanumque genus, quemadmodum sine Christi beneficio liberari nequiverat, ita nec conservari sine eius virtute potest. "Non est in alio aliquo salus. Nec enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri." (Act iv., 12.) Quae vita mortalium sit, unde exsulet Iesus, "Dei virtus et Dei sapientia," qui mores, quae extrema rerum non satis docent exemplo suo expertes christiani luminis gentes? Quarum qui parumper meminerit vel adumbratam apud Paulum (Ad Rom. I.) caecitatem mentis, depravationem naturae, portenta superstitionum ac libidinum, is profecto defixum misericordia simul atque horrore animum sentiat.—Comperta vulgo sunt, quae memoramus hoc loco, non tamen meditata, nec cogitata vulgo. Neque enim tam multos abalienaret superbia, aut socordia languefaceret, si divinorum beneficiorum late memoria coleretur, saepiusque repeteret animus, unde hominem Christus eripuit, et quo provexit. Exheres atque exsul tot iam aetates in interitum gens humana quotidie rapiebatur, formidolosis illis aliisque implicata malis, quae primorum parentum pepererat delictum, nec ea erant ulla humana ope sanabilia, quo tempore Christus Dominus, demissus e caelo liberator, apparuit. Eum quidem victorem dominatoremque serpentis futurum, Deus ipse in primo mundi ortu spondederat: inde in adventum eius intueri acri cum expectatione desiderii saecula consequentia. In eo spem omnem repositam, sacrorum fatum perdiu ac luculente cecinerant: quin etiam lecti cuiusdam populi varia fortuna, res gestae, instituta, leges, caeremoniae, sacrificia, distincte ac dilucide praesignificaverant, salutem hominum

generi perfectam absolutamque in eo fore, qui sacerdos tradebatur futurus, idemque hostia piacularis, restitutor humanae libertatis, princeps pacis, doctor universarum gentium, regni conditor in aeternitate temporum permansuri. Quibus et titulis et imaginibus et vaticiniis specie variis, re concinentibus, ille designabatur unus, qui propter nimiam caritatem suam qua dilexit nos, pro salute nostra sese aliquando devoveret. Sane cum divini venisset maturitas consilii, unigenitus Filius Dei, factus homo, violato Patris numini cumulatissime pro hominibus uberrimeque satisfecit de sanguine suo, tantoque redemptum pretio vindicavit sibi genus humanum. "Non corruptibilibus auro vel argento redempti estis: . . . sed pretioso sanguine quasi agni immaculati Christi, et incontaminati." (I. Pet. i., 18-19.) Ita omnes in universum homines potestati iam imperioque suo subiectos, quod cunctorum ipse et conditor est et conservator, vere proprieque redimendo, rursus fecit iuris sui. "Non estis vestri: empti enim estis pretio magno." (I. Cor. vi., 19-20.) Hinc a Deo instaurata in Christo omnia. "Sacramentum voluntatis suae, secundum beneplacitum eius, quod proposuit in eo, in dispensatione plenitudinis temporum instaurare omnia in Christo." (Eph. i., 9-10.) Cum delesset Iesus chirographum decreti, quod erat contrarium nobis, affigens illud cruci, continuo quievere caelestes irae; conturbato errantique hominum generi antiquae servitutis liberata nexa, Dei reconciliata voluntas, reddita gratia, reclusus aeternae beatitudinis aditus, eiusque potiundae et ius restitutum et instrumenta praebita. Tum velut excitatus e veterno quodam diuturno ac mortifero dispexit homo lumen veritatis concupitum per tot saecula quaesitumque frustra: in primisque agnovit, ad bona se multo altiora multoque magnificentiora natum quam haec sint, quae sensibus percipiuntur, fragilia et fluxa, quibus cogitationes curasque suas antea finierat: atque hanc omnino esse humanae constitutionem vitae, hanc legem supremam, huc tamquam ad finem omnia referenda, ut a Deo profecti, ad Deum aliquando revertamur. Ex hoc initio et fundamento recreata revixit conscientia dignitatis humanae: sensum fraternae omnium necessitudinis excepere pectora: tum officia et iura, id quod erat consequens, partim ad perfectionem adducta, partim ex integro constituta, simulque tales excitatae passim virtutes, quales ne suspicari quidem ulla veterum philosophia potuisset. Quamobrem consilia, actio vitae, mores, in alium abiere cursum: cumque Redemptoris late fluxisset cognitio, atque in intimas civitatum venas virtus eius, expultrix ignorantiae ac vitiorum veterum, permanasset, tum ea est conversio rerum consecuta, quae, christiana gentium humanitate parta, faciem orbis terrarum funditus commutavit.

Istarum in recordatione rerum quaedam inest, venerabiles

Fratres, infinita iucunditas, pariterque magna vis admonitionis, scilicet ut habeamus toto animo, referendamque curemus, ut potest, divino Servatori gratim.

Remoti ob vetustatem sumus ab originibus primordiisque restitutae salutis: quid tamen istuc referat, quando redemptionis perpetua virtus est, perenniaque et immortalia manent beneficia? Qui naturam peccato perditam reparavit semel, servat idem servabitque in perpetuum; "Dedit redemptionem semetipsum pro omnibus" (I. Tim. ii., 6.) "In Christo omnes vivificabuntur" (I. Cor. xv., 22.) "Et regni eius non erit finis." (Luc. i., 33.) Itaque ex aeterno Dei consilio, omnis est in Christo Iesu cum singulorum, tum universorum posita salus: eum qui deserunt, hoc ipso exitium sibi privatim coeco furore consciscunt, eodemque tempore committunt, quantum est in se, ut quam malorum calamitatumque molem pro pietate sua Redemptor depulerat, ad eam ipsam convictus humanus magna iactatus tempestate relabatur.

Rapiuntur enim errore vago optata, ab meta longius, quicumque in itinera se devia coniecerint. Similiter si lux veri pura et sincera respuatur, offundi caliginem mentibus, miseraque opinionum pravitate passim infatuari animos necesse est. Spes autem sanitatis quota potest esse reliqua iis, qui principium et fontem vitae deserant? Atqui via, veritas et vita Christus est unice. "Ego sum via, et veritas, et vita" (Io. xiv., 6): ita ut, eo posthabito, tria illa ad omnem salutem necessaria principia tollantur.

Num disserere est opus, quod ipsa res monet assidue, quodque vel in maxima mortalium bonorum affluentia in se quisque penitus sentit, nihil esse, praeter Deum, in quo voluntas humana absolute possit atque omni ex parte quiescere? Omnino finis homini, Deus: atque omnis haec, quae in terris degitur, aetas similitudinem peregrinationis cuiusdam atque imaginem verissime gerit. Iamvero via nobis Christus est, quia ex hoc mortali cursu, tam laborioso praesertim tamque ancipiti, ad summum et extremum bonorum, Deum, nulla ratione pervenire, nisi Christo auctore et duce, possumus. "Nemo venit ad Patrem, nisi per me." (Io. xiv., 6.) Quo modo nisi per eum? Nempe in primis et maxime, nisi per gratiam eius: quae tamen vacua in homine foret, neglectis praeceptis eius et legibus. Quod enim fieri, parta per Iesum Christum salute, oportebat, legem ipse suam reliquit custodem et procuratricem generis humani, qua nimirum gubernante, a vitae pravitate conversi, ad Deum homines suum securi contenderent. "Euntes docete omnes gentes: . . . docentes eos servare omnia quaecumque mandavi vobis. . . ." (Matt. xxviii., 19-20.) "Mandata mea servate." (Io. xiv., 15.) Ex quo intelligi debet, illud esse in professione christiana praeceptum planeque necessarium, praebere se ad Iesu Christi praecepta

docilem eique, ut domino ac regi summo, obnoxiam ac devotam penitus gerere voluntatem. Magna res, et quae multum saepe laborem vehementemque contentionem et constantiam desiderat. Quamvis enim Redemptoris beneficio humana sit reparata natura, superstes tamen in unoquoque nostrum velut quaedam aegrotatio est, infirmitas ac vitiositas. Appetitus varii huc atque illuc hominem rapiunt, rerumque externarum illecebrae facile impellunt animum ut, quod lubeat, non quod a Christo imperatum sit, sequatur. Atqui tamen contra nitendum, atque omnibus viribus repugnandum est cupiditatibus "in obsequium Christi:" quae, nisi parent rationi, dominantur, totumque hominem Christo ereptum, sibi faciunt servientem. "Homines corrupti mente, reprobi circa fidem, non efficiunt ut non serviant, . . . serviunt enim cupiditati triplici, vel voluptatis, vel excellentiae, vel spectaculi." (S. Aug. De vera rel., 37.) Atque in eiusmodi certamine sic quisque affectus esse debet, ut molestias etiam et incommoda sibi suscipienda, Christi caussa, putet. Difficile, quae tanto opere alliciunt atque oblectant, repellere: durum atque asperum ea, quae putantur bona corporis et fortunae, prae Christi domini voluntate imperioque contemnere: sed omnino christianum hominem oportet patientem et fortem esse in perferendo, si vult hoc, quod datum est vitae, christiane traducere. Oblitine sumus cuius corporis et cuius capitis simus membra? Proposito sibi gaudio sustinuit crucem, qui nobis ut nosmetipsos abnegaremus praescripsit. Ex ea vero affectione animi, quam diximus, humanae naturae dignitas pendet ipsa. Quod enim vel sapientia antiquorum saepe vidit, imperare sibi efficereque ut pars animi inferior obediat superiori, nequaquam est fractae voluntatis demissio, sed potius quaedam generosa virtus rationi mirifice congruens, in primisque homine digna.—Ceterum, multa ferre et perpeti, humana conditio est. Vitam sibi dolore vacuam atque omni expletam beatitudine extruere non plus homo potest, quam divini conditoris sui delere consilia, qui culpae veteris consecraria voluit manere perpetua. Consentaneum est ergo, non expectare in terris finem doloris, sed firmare animum ad ferendum dolorem, quo scilicet ad spem certam maximorum bonorum erudimur. Neque enim opibus aut vitae delicatiori, neque honoribus aut potentiae, sed patientiae et lacrimis, studio iustitiae et mundo cordi sempiternam in caelo beatitudinem Christus assignavit.

Hinc facile apparet quid sperari denique ex eorum errore superbiaque debeat, qui, spreto Redemptoris principatu, in summo rerum omnium fastigio hominem locant, atque imperare humanam naturam omni ratione atque in omnes partes statuunt oportere: quamquam id regnum non modo assequi, sed nec definire, quale sit, queunt. Iesu Christi regnum a divina caritate vim et formam sumit: diligere

sancte atque ordine, eius est fundamentum et summa. Ex quo illa necessario fluunt, officia inviolate servare: nihil alteri de iure detrudere: humana caelestibus inferiora ducere: amorem Dei rebus omnibus antepondere. Sed isthaec dominatio hominis, aut aperte Christum reiicientis aut non curantis agnoscere, tota nititur in amore sui, caritatis expers, devotionum nescia. Imperet quidem homo, per Iesum Christum licet: sed eo, quo solo potest, pacto, ut primum omnium serviat Deo, eiusque ab lege normam religiose petat disciplinamque vivendi.

Legem vero Christi dicimus non solum praecepta morum naturalia, aut ea quae acceperunt antiqui divinitus, quae utique Iesus Christus omnia perfecit et ad summum adduxit declarando, interpretando, sanciendo: verum etiam doctrinam eius reliquam, et omnes nominationes ab eo res institutas. Quarum profecto rerum caput est Ecclesia: immo ullaene res numerantur Christo auctore institutae, quas non illa cumulate complectatur et contineat? Porro Ecclesiae ministerio, praeclarissime ab se fundatae, perennare munus assignatum sibi a Patre voluit: cumque ex una parte praesidia salutis humanae in eam omnia contulisset, ex altera gravissime sanxit, ei ut homines perinde subessent ac sibimetipsi, eandemque studiose et in omni vita sequerentur ducem: "qui vos audit, me audit: et qui vos spernit, me spernit." (Luc. x., 16.) Quocirca omnino petenda ab Ecclesia lex Christi est: ideoque via homini Christus, via item Ecclesia: ille per se et natura sua; haec, mandato munere et communicatione potestatis. Ob eam rem quicumque ad salutem contendere seorsum ab Ecclesia velint, falluntur errore viae, frustra contendant.

Quae autem privatorum hominum, eadem fere est causa imperiorum: haec enim ipsa in exitus perniciosos incurrere necesse est, si digrediantur de via. Humanae procreator idemque redemptor naturae, Filius Dei, rex et dominus est orbis terrarum, potestatemque summam in homines obtinet cum singulos, tum iure sociatos. "Dedit ei potestatem, et honorem, et regnum: et omnes populi, tribus et linguae ipsi servant." (Daniel vii., 14.) "Ego autem constitutus sum rex ab eo. . . . Dabo tibi gentes haereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terrae." (Ps. ii.) Debet ergo in convictu humano et societate lex valere Christi, ita ut non privatae tantum ea sit, sed et publicae dux et magistra vitae. Quoniamque id ita est provisum et constitutum divinitus, nec repugnare quisquam impune potest, idcirco male consulitur rei publicae ubicumque instituta christiana non eo, quo debent, habeantur loco. Amoto Iesu, destituitur sibi humana ratio, maximo orbata praesidio et lumine: tum ipsa facile obscuratur notio causae, quae causa, Deo auctore, genuit communem societatem, quaeque in hoc consistit

maxime ut, civili coniunctione adiutrice, consequantur cives naturale bonum, sed prorsus summo illi, quod supra naturam est, perfectissimoque et perpetuo bono convenienter. Occupatis rerum confusione mentibus, ingrediuntur itinere devio tam qui parent, quam qui imperant: abest enim quod tuto sequantur, et in quo consistent.

Quo pacto miserum et calamitosum aberrare de via, simillime deserere veritatem. Prima autem et absoluta et essentialis veritas Christus est, utpote Verbum Dei, consubstantiale et coaeternum Patri, unum ipse et Pater. "Ego sum via, et veritas." Itaque, si verum quaeritur, pareat primum omnium Iesu Christo, in eiusque magisterio segura conquiescat humana ratio, propterea quod Christi voce loquitur ipsa veritas.—Innumerabilia genera sunt, in quibus humani facultas ingenii, velut in uberrimo campo et quidem suo, investigando contemplandoque, libere excurrat, idque non solum concedente, sed plane postulante natura. Illud nefas et contra naturam, contineri mentem nolle finibus suis, abiectâque modestia debita, Christi docentis aspernari auctoritatem. Doctrina ea, unde nostra omnium pendet salus, fere de Deo est rebusque divinissimis: neque sapientia hominis cuiusquam peperit eam, sed Filius Dei ipso ab Patre suo totam hausit atque accepit: "Verba quae dedisti mihi, dedi eis." (Io. xvii., 8.) Idcirco plura necessario complectitur, non quae rationi dissentiant, id enim fieri nullo pacto potest, sed quorum altitudinem cogitatione assequi non magis possumus, quam comprehendere, qualis est in se, Deum. At enim si tam multae res existunt occultae et a natura ipsa involutae, quas nulla queat humana explicare sollertia, de quibus tamen nemo sanus dubitare ausit, erit quidem libertate perverse utentium non ea perferre quae supra universam naturam longe sunt posita, quod percipere qualia sint non licet. Nolle dogmata huc plane recidit, christianam religionem nullam esse velle. Porro flectenda mens demisse et obnoxie "in obsequium Christi," usque adeo, ut eius numine imperioque velut captiva teneatur: "In captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi." (II. Cor. x., 5.) Tale prorsus obsequium est, quod Christus sibi tributum vult; et iure vult, Deus est enim, proptereaque sicut voluntatis in homine, ita et intelligentiae unus habet summum imperium. Serviens autem intelligentiâ Christo domino, nequaquam facit homo serviliter, sed maxime convenienter tum rationi, tum nativae excellentiae suae. Nam voluntate in imperium concedit non hominis cuiuspiam, sed auctoris sui ac principis omnium Dei, cui subiectus est lege naturae: nec astringi se humani opinionatione magistri patitur, sed aeterna atque immutabili veritate. Ita et mentis naturale bonum, et libertatem simul consequitur. Veritas enim, quae a Christi magisterio proficiscitur, in conspicuo ponit, unaquaeque res qualis in se sit et quanti: qua imbutus cog-

nitione, si perceptae veritati paruerit homo, non se rebus, sed sibi res, nec rationem libidini, sed libidinem rationi subiiciet: peccatique et errorum pessima servitute depulsa, in libertatem praestantissimam vindicabitur: "Cognoscetis veritatem, et veritas liberabit vos." (Io. viii., 32.)—Apparet igitur, quorum mens imperium Christi recusat, eos pervicaci voluntate contra Deum contendere. Elapsi autem e potestate divina, non propterea solutiores futuri sunt: incident in potestatem aliquam humanam: eligent quippe, ut fit, unum aliquem, quem audiant, cui obtemperent, quem sequantur magistrum. Ad haec, mentem suam, a rerum divinarum communicatione seclusam, in angustiore scientiae gyrum compellunt, et ad ea ipsa, quae ratione cognoscuntur, venient minus instructi ad proficiendum. Sunt enim in natura rerum non pauca, quibus vel percipiendis, vel explicandis plurimum affert divina doctrina luminis. Nec raro, poenas de superbia sumpturus, sinit illos Deus non vera cernere, ut in quo peccant, in eo plectantur. Utraque de caussa permultos saepe videre licet magnis ingeniis exquisitaque eruditione praeditos, tamen in ipsa exploratione naturae tam absurda consecutantes, ut nemo deterius erraverit.

Certum igitur sit, intelligentiam in vita christiana auctoritati divinae totam et penitus esse tradendam. Quod si in eo quod ratio cedit auctoritati, elatior ille animus, qui tantam habet in nobis vim, comprimitur et dolet aliquid, inde magis emergit, magnam esse in christiano oportere non voluntatis dumtaxat, sed etiam mentis tolerantiam. Atque id velimus meminisse, qui cogitatione sibi fingunt ac plane mallent quamdam in christiana professione et sentiendi disciplinam et agendi, cuius essent praecepta molliora, quaeque humanae multo indulgentior naturae, nullam in nobis tolerantiam requireret, aut mediocrem. Non satis vim intelligunt fidei institutorumque christianorum: non vident, undique nobis occurrere Crucem, exemplum vitae vexillumque perpetuum iis omnibus futurum, qui re ac factis, non tantum nomine, sequi Christum velint.

Vitam esse, solius est Dei. Ceterae naturae omnes participes vitae sunt, vita non sunt. Ex omni autem aeternitate ac suapte naturâ vita Christus est, quo modo est veritas, quia Deus de Deo. Ab ipso, ut ab ultimo augustissimoque principio, vita omnis in mundum influxit perpetuoque influet: quidquid est, per ipsum est, quidquid vivit, per ipsum vivit, quia omnia per Verbum "facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est."—Id quidem in vita naturae: sed multo meliorem vitam multoque potiore satis iam tetigimus supra, Christi ipsius beneficio partam, nempe vitam gratiae, cuius beatissimus est exitus vita gloriae, ad quam cogitationes atque actiones referendae omnes. In hoc est omnis vis doctrinae legumque christianarum ut "peccatis mortui, iustitiae viva-

mus" (I. Pet. ii., 24), id est virtuti et sanctitati, in quo moralis vita animorum cum explorata spe beatitudinis sempiternae consistit. Sed vere et proprie et ad salutem apte nulla re alia, nisi fide christiana, alitur iustitia. "Iustus ex fide vivit." (Galat. iii., 11.) "Sine fide impossibile est placere Deo." (Hebr. xi., 6.) Itaque sator et parens et altor fidei Iesus Christus, ipse est qui vitam in nobis moralem conservat ac sustentat: idque potissimum Ecclesiae ministerio: huic enim, benigno providentissimoque consilio, administranda instrumenta tradidit, quae hanc, de qua loquimur, vitam gignerent, generatam tuerentur, extinctam renovarent. Vis igitur procreatrix eademque conservatrix virtutum salutarium eliditur, si disciplina morum a fide divina diiungitur: ac sane despoliant hominem dignitate maxima, vitaeque deiectum supernaturali ad naturalem perniciosissime revolvunt, qui mores dirigi ad honestatem uno rationis magisterio volunt. Non quod praecepta naturae dispicere ac servare recta ratione homo plura non queat: sed omnia quamvis dispiceret et sine ulla offensione in omni vita servaret, quod nisi opitulante Redemptoris gratia non potest, tamen frustra quisquam, expers fidei, de salute sempiterna confideret. "Si quis in me non manserit, mittetur foras sicut palmes; et arescet, et colligent eum, et in ignem mittent, et ardet." (Io. xv., 6.) "Qui non crediderit, condemnabitur." (Marc. xvi., 16.) Ad extremum quanti sit in se ipsa, et quos pariat fructus ista divinae fidei contemptrix honestas, nimis multa habemus documenta ante oculos. Quid est quod in tanto studio stabiliendae augendaeque prosperitatis publicae, laborant tamen ac paene aegrotant civitates tam multis in rebus tamque gravibus quotidie magis? Utique civilem societatem satis aiunt fretam esse per se ipsam: posse sine praesidio institutorum christianorum commode se habere, atque eo, quo spectat, uno labore suo pervenire. Hinc quae administrantur publice, ea more profano administrari malunt: ita ut in disciplina civili vitaeque publica populorum vestigia religionis avitae pauciora quotidie videas. At non cernunt satis quid agant. Nam submoto numine recta et prava sancientis Dei, excidere auctoritate principe leges necesse est, iustitiamque collabi, quae duo firmissima sunt coniunctionis civilis maximeque necessaria vincula. Similique modo, sublata semel spe atque expectatione bonorum immortalium, pronum est mortalia sitienter appetere: de quibus trahere ad se, quanto plus poterit, conabitur quisque pro viribus. Hinc aemulari, invidere, odisse; tum consilia teterrima: de gradu deiectam velle omnem potestatem, meditari passim dementes ruinas. Non pacatae res foris, non securitas domi: deformata sceleribus vita communis.

In tanto cupiditatum certamine, tantoque discrimine, aut extrema metuenda perniciēs, aut idoneum quaerendum mature remedium.

Coercere maleficos, vocare ad mansuetudinem mores populares atque omni ratione detertere a delictis providentiâ legum, rectum idemque necessarium: nequaquam tamen in isto omnia. Altius sanatio petenda populorum: advocanda vis humanâ maior, quae attingat animos, renovatosque ad conscientiam officii, efficiat meliores: ipsa illa nimirum vis, quae multo maioribus fessum malis vindicavit semel ab interitu orbem terrarum. Fac reviviscere et valere, amotis impedimentis, christianos in civitate spiritus; recreabitur civitas. Conticescere proclive erit inferiorum ordinum cum superioribus contentionem, ac sancta utrinque iura consistere verecundiâ mutuâ. Si Christum audiant, manebunt in officio fortunati aequae ac miseri: alteri iustitiam et caritatem sentient sibi esse servandam, si salvi esse volunt, alteri temperantiam et modum. Optime constiterit domestica societas, custode salutari metu iubentis, vetantis Dei: eademque ratione plurimum illa in populis valebunt, quae ab ipsa natura praecipuntur, vereri potestatem legitimam et obtemperare legibus ius esse: nihil seditiose facere, nec per coitiones moliri quicquam. Ita, ubi christiana lex omnibus praesit et eam nulla res impediât, ibi sponte fit ut conservetur ordo divina providentia constitutus, unde efflorescit cum incolumitate prosperitas. Clamat ergo communis salus, referre se necesse esse, unde numquam digredi oportuerat, ad eum qui via et veritas et vita est, nec singulos dumtaxat, sed societatem humanam universe. In hanc velut in possessionem suam, restitui Christum dominum oportet, efficiendumque ut profectam ab eo vitam hauriant atque imbibant omnia membra et partes reipublicae, iussa ac vetita legum, instituta popularia, domicilia doctrinae, ius coniugiorum convictusque domestici, tecta locupletium, officinae opificum. Nec fugiat quemquam, ex hoc pendere magnopere ipsam, quae tam vehementer expetitur, gentium humanitatem, quippe quae alitur et augetur non tam iis rebus, quae sunt corporis, commoditatibus et copiis, quam iis, quae sunt animi, laudabilibus moribus et cultu virtutum.

Alieni a Iesu Christo plerique sunt ignorance magis, quam voluntate improba: qui enim hominem, qui mundum studeant dedita opera cognoscere, quam plurimi numerantur; qui Filium Dei, perpauci. Primum igitur sit, ignorance scientiâ depellere, ne repudietur aut spernatur ignotus. Quotquot ubique sunt, christianos obtestamur dare velint operam, quoad quisque potest, Redemptorem suum ut noscant, qualis est: in quem ut quis intuebitur mente sincera iudicioque integro, ita perspicue cernet nec eius lege fieri quicquam posse salubrius, nec doctrinâ divinius. In quo mirum quantum allatura adiumenti est auctoritas atque opera vestra, venerabiles Fratres, tum Cleri totius studium et sedulitas. Insculpere populorum in animis germanam notionem ac prope imaginem Iesu

Christi, eiusque caritatem, beneficia, instituta illustrare litteris, sermone, in scholis puerilibus, in gymnasiis, in concione, ubicumque se det occasio, partes officii vestri praecipuas putatote. De iis, quae appellantur iura hominis, satis audiit multitudo: audiat aliquando de iuribus Dei. Idoneum tempus esse, vel ipsa indicant excitata iam, ut diximus, multorum recta studia, atque ista nominatim in Redemptorem tot significationibus testata pietas, quam quidem saeculo insequenti, si Deo placet, in auspiciis melioris aevi tradituri sumus. Verum, cum res agatur quam non aliunde sperare nisi a gratia divina licet, communi studio summisque precibus flectere ad misericordiam insistamus omnipotentem Deum, ut interire ne patiatur, quos ipsemet profuso sanguine liberavit: respiciat hanc propitius aetatem, quae multum quidem deliquit, sed multa vicissim ad patiendum aspera in expiationem exanclavit: omniumque gentium generumque homines benigne complexus, meminerit suum illud: "Ego si exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad meipsum." (Io. xii., 32.)

Auspiciem divinorum munerum, benevolentiaeque Nostrae paternae testem vobis, venerabiles Fratres, Clero populoque vestro Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 1 Novembris An MDCCCC., Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo tertio.

LEO PP. XIII.

JESUS CHRIST OUR REDEEMER.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN, THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES,
ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER LOCAL ORDINARIES
HAVING PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH

THE HOLY SEE.

LEO XIII., POPE.

VENERABLE BRETHREN,

HEALTH AND THE APOSTOLIC BENEDICTION.

THE outlook on the future is by no means free from anxiety; on the contrary, there are many serious reasons for alarm, on account of numerous and long-standing causes of evil, of both a public and a private nature. Nevertheless, the close of the century really seems in God's mercy to afford us some degree of consolation and hope. For no one will deny that renewed interest in spiritual matters and a revival of Christian faith and piety are influences of great moment for the common good. And there are suffi-

ciently clear indications at the present day of a very general revival or augmentation of these virtues. For example, in the very midst of worldly allurements and in spite of so many obstacles to piety, what great crowds have flocked to Rome to visit the "Threshold of the Apostles" at the invitation of the Sovereign Pontiff! Both Italians and foreigners are openly devoting themselves to religious exercises, and, relying upon the indulgences offered by the Church, are most earnestly seeking the means to secure their eternal salvation. Who could fail to be moved by the present evident increase of devotion towards the person of Our Saviour? The ardent zeal of so many thousands, united in heart and mind, "from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof," in venerating the Name of Jesus Christ and proclaiming His praises, is worthy of the best days of Christianity. Would that the outburst of these flames of antique faith might be followed by a mighty conflagration! Would that the splendid example of so many might kindle the enthusiasm of all! For what so necessary for our times as a widespread renovation among the nations of Christian principles and old-fashioned virtues? The great misfortune is that too many turn a deaf ear and will not listen to the teachings of this revival of piety. Yet, "did they but know the gift of God," did they but realize that the greatest of all misfortunes is to fall away from the World's Redeemer and to abandon Christian faith and practice, they would be only too eager to turn back, and so escape certain destruction.

The most important duty of the Church, and the one most peculiarly her own, is to defend and to propagate throughout the world the Kingdom of the Son of God, and to bring all men to salvation by communicating to them the divine benefits, so much so that her power and authority are chiefly exercised in this one work. Towards this end we are conscious of having devoted our energies throughout our difficult and anxious Pontificate even to the present day. And you too, Venerable Brethren, are wont constantly, yea daily, to give your chief thoughts and endeavors together with ourselves to the self-same task. But at the present moment all of us ought to make still further efforts, more especially on the occasion of the Holy Year, to disseminate far and wide the better knowledge and love of Jesus Christ by teaching, persuading, exhorting, if perchance our voice can be heard; and this, not so much to those who are ever ready to listen willingly to Christian teachings, but to those most unfortunate men who, whilst professing the Christian name, live strangers to the faith and love of Christ. For these we feel the profoundest pity: these above all would we urge to think seriously of their present life and what its consequences will be if they do not repent.

The greatest of all misfortunes is never to have known Jesus Christ: yet such a state is free from the sin of obstinacy and ingratitude. But first to have known Him, and afterwards to deny or forget Him, is a crime so foul and so insane that it seems impossible for any man to be guilty of it. For Christ is the fountain-head of all good. Mankind can no more be saved without His power, than it could be redeemed without His mercy. "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 12). What kind of life that is from which Jesus Christ, "the power of God and the wisdom of God," is excluded; what kind of morality and what manner of death are its consequences, can be clearly learnt from the example of nations deprived of the light of Christianity. If we but recall St. Paul's description (Romans i., 24-32) of the mental blindness, the natural depravity, the monstrous superstitions and lusts of such peoples, our minds will be filled with horror and pity. What we here record is well enough known, but not sufficiently realized or thought about. Pride would not mislead, nor indifference enervate, so many minds, if the Divine mercies were more generally called to mind and if it were remembered from what an abyss Christ delivered mankind and to what a height He raised it. The human race, exiled and disinherited, had for ages been daily hurrying into ruin, involved in the terrible and numberless ills brought about by the sin of our first parents, nor was there any human hope of salvation, when Christ Our Lord came down as the Saviour from Heaven. At the very beginning of the world, God had promised Him as the conqueror of "the Serpent," hence, succeeding ages had eagerly looked forward to His coming. The prophets had long and clearly declared that all hope was in Him. The varying fortunes, the achievements, customs, laws, ceremonies and sacrifices of the Chosen People had distinctly and lucidly foreshadowed the truth, that the salvation of mankind was to be accomplished in Him who should be the Priest, Victim, Liberator, Prince of Peace, Teacher of all Nations, Founder of an Eternal Kingdom. By all these titles, images and prophecies, differing in kind though like in meaning, He alone was designated who "for His exceeding charity wherewith He loved us," gave Himself up for our salvation. And so, when the fullness of time came in God's Divine Providence, the only-begotten Son of God became man, and in behalf of mankind made most abundant satisfaction in His Blood to the outraged majesty of His Father, and by this infinite price He redeemed man for His own. "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold or silver . . . but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a lamb, unspotted and undefiled" (I. Peter i., 18-19). Thus all men, though already subject to His kingly

power, inasmuch as He is the Creator and Preserver of all, were over and above made His property by a true and real purchase. "You are not your own: for you are bought with a great price" (II. Corinthians vi., 19-20). Hence in Christ all things are made new. "The mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed to Him, in the dispensation of the fullness of times to re-establish all things in Christ" (Ephesians i., 9-10). When Jesus Christ had blotted out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, fastening it to the cross, at once God's wrath was appeased, the primeval fetters of slavery were struck off from unhappy and erring man, God's favor was won back, grace restored, the gates of Heaven opened, the right to enter them revived, and the means afforded of doing so. Then man, as though awakening from a long-continued and deadly lethargy, beheld at length the light of the truth, for long ages desired, yet sought in vain. First of all, he realized that he was born to much higher and more glorious things than the frail and inconstant objects of sense which had hitherto formed the end of his thoughts and cares. He learnt that the meaning of human life, the supreme law, the end of all things was this: that we come from God and must return to Him. From this first principle the consciousness of human dignity was revived: men's hearts realized the universal brotherhood: as a consequence, human rights and duties were either perfected or even newly created, whilst on all sides were evoked virtues undreamt of in pagan philosophy. Thus men's aims, life, habits and customs received a new direction. As the knowledge of the Redeemer spread far and wide and His power, which destroyeth ignorance and former vices, penetrated into the very life-blood of the nations, such a change came about that the face of the world was entirely altered by the creation of a Christian civilization. The remembrance of these events, Venerable Brethren, is full of infinite joy, but it also teaches us the lesson that we must both feel and render with our whole hearts gratitude to our Divine Saviour.

We are indeed now very far removed in time from the first beginnings of Redemption; but what difference does this make when the benefits thereof are perennial and immortal? He who once hath restored human nature ruined by sin the same preserveth and will preserve it forever. "He gave Himself a redemption for all" (I. Timothy ii., 6). "In Christ all shall be made alive" (I. Corinthians xv., 22). "And of His Kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i., 33). Hence by God's eternal decree the salvation of all men, both severally and collectively, depends upon Jesus Christ. Those who abandon Him become guilty by the very fact, in their blindness and folly, of their own ruin; whilst at the same time they do all that in them lies to bring about a violent reaction of mankind in the direc-

tion of that mass of evils and miseries from which the Redeemer in His mercy had freed them.

Those who go astray from the road wander far from the goal they aim at. Similarly, if the pure and true light of truth be rejected, men's minds must necessarily be darkened and their souls deceived by deplorably false ideas. What hope of salvation can they have who abandon the very principle and fountain of life? Christ alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life (John xiv., 6). If He be abandoned the three necessary conditions of salvation are removed.

It is surely unnecessary to prove, what experience constantly shows and what each individual feels in himself, even in the very midst of all temporal prosperity—that in God alone can the human will find absolute and perfect peace. God is the only end of man. All our life on earth is the truthful and exact image of a pilgrimage. Now Christ is the "Way," for we can never reach God, the supreme and ultimate good, by this toilsome and doubtful road of mortal life, except with Christ as our leader and guide. How so? Firstly and chiefly by His grace; but this would remain "void" in man if the precepts of His law were neglected. For, as was necessarily the case after Jesus Christ had won our salvation, He left behind Him His Law for the protection and welfare of the human race, under the guidance of which men, converted from evil life, might safely tend towards God. "Going, teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew xxviii., 19-20). "Keep My commandments" (John xiv., 15). Hence it will be understood that in the Christian religion the first and most necessary condition is docility to the precepts of Jesus Christ, absolute loyalty of will towards Him as Lord and King. A serious duty, and one which oftentimes calls for strenuous labor, earnest endeavor and perseverance! For although by Our Redeemer's grace human nature hath been regenerated, still there remains in each individual a certain debility and tendency to evil. Various natural appetites attract man on one side and the other; the allurements of the material world impel his soul to follow after what is pleasant rather than the law of Christ. Still we must strive our best and resist our natural inclinations with all our strength "unto the obedience of Christ." For unless they obey reason they become our masters, and carrying the whole man away from Christ, make him their slave. "Men of corrupt mind, who have made shipwreck of the faith, cannot help being slaves. . . . They are slaves to a threefold concupiscence: of will, of pride, or of outward show" (St. Augustine, *De Vera Religione*, 37). In this contest every man must be prepared to undergo hardships and troubles for Christ's sake. It is difficult to reject what so powerfully entices and delights. It is hard and

Vol. XXVI—Sig. 12.

painful to despise the supposed goods of the senses and of fortune for the will and precepts of Christ Our Lord. But the Christian is absolutely obliged to be firm, and patient in suffering, if he wish to lead a Christian life. Have we forgotten of what Body and of what Head we are the members? "Having joy set before Him, He endured the Cross," and He bade us deny ourselves. The very dignity of human nature depends upon this disposition of mind. For, as even the ancient pagan philosophy perceived, to be master of oneself and to make the lower part of the soul obey the superior part, is so far from being a weakness of will that it is really a noble power, in consonance with right reason and most worthy of a man. Moreover, to bear and to suffer is the ordinary condition of man. Man can no more create for himself a life free from suffering and filled with all happiness than he can abrogate the decrees of his Divine Maker, who has willed that the consequences of original sin should be perpetual. It is reasonable, therefore, not to expect an end to troubles in this world, but rather to steel one's soul to bear troubles, by which we are taught to look forward with certainty to supreme happiness. Christ has not promised eternal bliss in heaven to riches, nor to a life of ease, to honors or to power, but to long-suffering and to tears, to the love of justice and to cleanness of heart.

From this it may clearly be seen what consequences are to be expected from that false pride which, rejecting our Saviour's Kingship, places man at the summit of all things and declares that human nature must rule supreme. And yet this supreme rule can neither be attained nor even defined. The rule of Jesus Christ derives its form and its power from Divine Love: a holy and orderly charity is both its foundation and its crown. Its necessary consequences are the strict fulfilment of duty, respect of mutual rights, the estimation of the things of heaven above those of earth, the preference of the love of God to all things. But this supremacy of man, which openly rejects Christ, or at least ignores Him, is entirely founded upon selfishness, knowing neither charity nor self-devotion. Man may indeed be king, through Jesus Christ; but only on condition that he first of all obey God, and diligently seek his rule of life in God's law. By the law of Christ we mean not only the natural precepts of morality and the Ancient Law, all of which Jesus Christ has perfected and crowned by His declaration, explanation and sanction; but also the rest of His doctrine and His own peculiar institutions. Of these the chief is His Church. Indeed, whatsoever things Christ has instituted are most fully contained in His Church. Moreover, He willed to perpetuate the office assigned to Him by His Father by means of the ministry of the Church so gloriously founded by Himself. On the one hand He confided to her all the means of man's

salvation; on the other He most solemnly commanded men to be subject to her and to obey her diligently, and to follow her even as Himself: "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me" (Luke x., 16.) Wherefore the law of Christ must be sought in the Church. Christ is man's "Way;" the Church also is his "Way"—Christ of Himself and by His very nature, the Church by His commission and the communication of His power. Hence all who would find salvation apart from the Church are led astray and strive in vain.

As with individuals, so with nations. These, too, must necessarily tend to ruin if they go astray from "The Way." The Son of God, the Creator and Redeemer of mankind, is King and Lord of the earth, and holds supreme dominion over men, both individually and collectively. "And He gave Him power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve Him" (Daniel vii., 14). "I am appointed King by Him. . . . I will give Thee the Gentiles for Thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession" (Psalm ii., 6, 8). Therefore the law of Christ ought to prevail in human society and be the guide and teacher of public as well as of private life. Since this is so by divine decree, and no man may with impunity contravene it, it is an evil thing for the common weal wherever Christianity does not hold the place that belongs to it. When Jesus Christ is absent, human reason fails, being bereft of its chief protection and light, and the very end is lost sight of for which, under God's providence, human society has been built up. This end is the obtaining by the members of society of natural good through the aid of civil unity, though always in harmony with the perfect and eternal good which is above nature. But when men's minds are clouded, both rulers and ruled go astray, for they have no safe line to follow nor end to aim at.

Just as it is the height of misfortune to go astray from the "Way," so is it to abandon the "Truth." Christ Himself is the first, absolute and essential "Truth," inasmuch as He is the Word of God, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father, He and the Father being One. "I am the Way and the Truth." Wherefore if the Truth be sought by the human intellect, it must first of all submit it to Jesus Christ, and securely rest upon His teaching, since therein Truth itself speaketh. There are innumerable and extensive fields of thought, properly belonging to the human mind, in which it may have free scope for its investigations and speculations, and that not only agreeably to its nature, but even by a necessity of its nature. But what is unlawful and unnatural is that the human mind should refuse to be restricted within its proper limits, and throwing aside its becoming modesty, should refuse to acknowledge Christ's teach-

ing. This teaching, upon which our salvation depends, is almost entirely about God and the things of God. No human wisdom has invented it, but the Son of God hath received and drunk it in entirely from His Father: "The words which thou gavest me, I have given to them" (John xvii., 8.) Hence this teaching necessarily embraces many subjects which are not indeed contrary to reason—for that would be an impossibility—but so exalted that we can no more attain them by our own reasoning than we can comprehend God as He is in Himself. If there be so many things hidden and veiled by nature which no human ingenuity can explain, and yet which no man in his senses can doubt, it would be an abuse of liberty to refuse to accept those which are entirely above nature, because their essence cannot be discovered. To reject dogma is simply to deny Christianity. Our intellect must bow humbly and reverently "unto the obedience of Christ," so that it be held captive by His divinity and authority: "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" (II. Corinthians x., 5.) Such obedience Christ requires, and justly so. For He is God, and as such holds supreme dominion over man's intellect as well as over his will. By obeying Christ with his intellect man by no means acts in a servile manner, but in complete accordance with his reason and his natural dignity. For by his will he yields not to the authority of any man, but to that of God, the author of his being, and the first principle to Whom he is subject by the very law of his nature. He does not suffer himself to be forced by the theories of any human teacher, but by the eternal and unchangeable truth. Hence he attains at one and the same time the natural good of the intellect and his own liberty. For the truth which proceeds from the teaching of Christ clearly demonstrates the real nature and value of every being; and man, being endowed with this knowledge, if he but obey the truth as perceived, will make all things subject to himself, not himself to them; his appetites to his reason, not his reason to his appetites. Thus the slavery of sin and falsehood will be shaken off, and the most perfect liberty attained: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John viii., 32). It is, then, evident that those whose intellect rejects the yoke of Christ are obstinately striving against God. Having shaken off God's authority, they are by no means freer, for they will fall beneath some human sway. They are sure to choose some one whom they will listen to, obey and follow as their guide. Moreover, they withdraw their intellect from the communication of divine truths, and thus limit it within a narrower circle of knowledge, so that they are less fitted to succeed in the pursuit even of natural science. For there are in nature very many things whose apprehension or explanation is greatly aided by

the light of divine truth. Not unfrequently, too, God, in order to chastise their pride, does not permit men to see the truth, and thus they are punished in the things wherein they sin. This is why we often see men of great intellectual power and erudition making the grossest blunders even in natural science.

It must, therefore, be clearly admitted that in the life of a Christian the intellect must be entirely subject to God's authority. And if, in this submission of reason to authority our self-love, which is so strong, is restrained and made to suffer, this only proves the necessity to a Christian of long-suffering not only in will, but also in intellect. We would remind those persons of this truth who desire a kind of Christianity such as they themselves have devised, whose precepts should be very mild, much more indulgent towards human nature, and requiring little if any hardships to be borne. They do not properly understand the meaning of faith and Christian precepts. They do not see that the Cross meets us everywhere, the model of our life, the eternal standard of all who wish to follow Christ in reality and not merely in name.

God alone is Life. All other beings partake of life, but *are* not life. Christ from all eternity and by His very nature is "the Life," just as He is the Truth, because He is God of God. From Him, as from its most sacred source, all life pervades and ever will pervade creation. Whatever is, is by Him; whatever lives, lives by Him. For by the Word "all things were made; and without Him was made nothing that was made." This is true of the natural life; but, as We have sufficiently indicated above, we have a much higher and better life, won for us by Christ's mercy, that is to say, "the life of grace," whose happy consummation is "the life of glory," to which all our thoughts and actions ought to be directed. The whole object of Christian doctrine and morality is that "we being dead to sin, should live to justice" (I. Peter ii., 24)—that is, to virtue and holiness. In this consists the moral life, with the certain hope of a happy eternity. This justice, in order to be advantageous to salvation, is nourished by Christian faith. "The just man liveth by faith" (Galatians iii., 11). "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Hebrews xi., 6). Consequently Jesus Christ, the creator and preserver of faith, also preserves and nourishes our moral life. This He does chiefly by the ministry of His Church. To her, in His wise and merciful counsel, He has entrusted certain agencies which engender the supernatural life, protect it, and revive it if it should fail. This generative and conservative power of the virtues that make for salvation is therefore lost whenever morality is dissociated from divine faith. A system of morality based exclusively on human reason robs man of his highest dignity and lowers him from the

supernatural to the merely natural life. Not but that man is able by the right use of reason to know and to obey certain principles of the natural law. But though he should know them all and keep them inviolate through life—and even this is impossible without the aid of the grace of our Redeemer—still it is in vain for any one without faith to promise himself eternal salvation. “If any one abide not in Me, he shall be cast forth as a branch, and shall wither, and they shall gather him up and cast him into the fire, and he burneth” (John xv., 6). “He that believeth not shall be condemned” (Mark xvi., 16). We have but too much evidence of the value and result of a morality divorced from divine faith. How is it that in spite of all the zeal for the welfare of the masses, nations are in such straits and even distress, and that the evil is daily on the increase? We are told that society is quite able to help itself; that it can flourish without the assistance of Christianity, and attain its end by its own unaided efforts. Public administrators prefer a purely secular system of government. All traces of the religion of our forefathers are daily disappearing from political life and administration. What blindness! Once the idea of the authority of God as the Judge of right and wrong is forgotten, law must necessarily lose its primary authority and justice must perish: and these are the two most powerful and most necessary bonds of society. Similarly, once the hope and expectation of eternal happiness is taken away, temporal goods will be greedily sought after. Every man will strive to secure the largest share for himself. Hence arise envy, jealousy, hatred. The consequences are conspiracy, anarchy, nihilism. There is neither peace abroad nor security at home. Public life is stained with crime.

So great is this struggle of the passions and so serious the dangers involved that we must either anticipate ultimate ruin or seek for an efficient remedy. It is, of course, both right and necessary to punish malefactors, to educate the masses, and by legislation to prevent crime in every possible way: but all this is by no means sufficient. The salvation of the nations must be looked for higher. A power greater than human must be called in to teach men's hearts, awaken in them the sense of duty and make them better. This is the power which once before saved the world from destruction when groaning under much more terrible evils. Once remove all impediments and allow the Christian spirit to revive and grow strong in a nation and that nation will be healed. The strife between the classes and the masses will die away; mutual rights will be respected. If Christ be listened to, both rich and poor will do their duty. The former will realize that they must observe justice and charity, the latter self-restraint and moderation, if both are to be saved. Domestic life

will be firmly established by the salutary fear of God as the Law-giver. In the same way the precepts of the natural law, which dictates respect for lawful authority and obedience to the laws, will exercise their influence over the people. Seditions and conspiracies will cease. Wherever Christianity rules over all without let or hindrance, there the order established by Divine Providence is preserved, and both security and prosperity are the happy result. The common welfare, then, urgently demands a return to Him from whom we should never have gone astray; to Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life—and this on the part not only of individuals, but of society as a whole. We must restore Christ to this His own rightful possession. All elements of the national life must be made to drink in the Life which proceedeth from Him—legislation, political institutions, education, marriage and family life, capital and labor. Every one must see that the very growth of civilization which is so ardently desired depends greatly upon this, since it is fed and grows not so much by material wealth and prosperity, as by the spiritual qualities of morality and virtue.

It is rather ignorance than ill-will which keeps multitudes away from Jesus Christ. There are many who study humanity and the natural world; few who study the Son of God. The first step, then, is to substitute knowledge for ignorance, so that He may no longer be despised or rejected because He is unknown. We conjure all Christians throughout the world to strive all they can to know their Redeemer as He really is. The more one contemplates Him with sincere and unprejudiced mind, the clearer does it become that there can be nothing more salutary than His law, more divine than His teaching. In this work your influence, Venerable Brethren, and the zeal and earnestness of the entire clergy can do wonders. You must look upon it as a chief part of your duty to engrave upon the minds of your people the true knowledge, the very likeness of Jesus Christ; to illustrate His charity, His mercies, His teaching, by your writings and your words, in schools, in universities, from the pulpit; wherever opportunity is offered you. The world has heard enough of the so-called "rights of man." Let it hear something of the rights of God. That the time is suitable is proved by the very general revival of religious feeling already referred to, and especially that devotion towards Our Saviour of which there are so many indications, and which, please God, we shall hand on to the New Century as a pledge of happier times to come. But as this consummation cannot be hoped for except by the aid of divine grace, let us strive in prayer, with united heart and voice, to incline Almighty God unto mercy, that He would not suffer those to perish whom He had redeemed by His Blood. May He look down in mercy upon this world, which

has indeed sinned much, but which has also suffered much in expiation! And embracing in His loving-kindness all races and classes of mankind, may He remember His own words: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to Myself" (John xii., 32).

As a pledge of the Divine favors and in token of Our fatherly affection, We lovingly impart to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your Clergy and People, the Apostolic Blessing.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, the first day of November, 1900, in the twenty-third year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., Pope.

Scientific Chronicle.

FURNACE GASES.

The gases resulting from the combustion of fuel in blast furnaces have been turned to little practical use or have been entirely lost for commercial purposes. This loss has not been overlooked by practical men, and the question of the utilization of the discharge gases from blast furnaces has been under consideration for a long time. That they can be utilized has been settled in the affirmative, and now the search is for the best results in their utilization. On this point the article of Mr. F. W. Gordon in the *Iron Age*, showing their availability in the production of power according to the efficiency of the process is of interest.

From careful investigations Mr. Gordon considers, as a fair estimate, that 1,862 pounds of coke is burned per ton of pig iron. This is followed by a computation of what amount of heat is used by the furnace and what amount is available for other purposes. Judging of the completeness of the combustion from the composition of the discharge gases, it is fairly estimated that the total heat of the consumed gases would be 7,889.93 British thermal units. From this amount must be taken the loss in chimney gases, in radiation and connection from stoves and boilers, and the heat actually available would be 5,986.74 heat units, leaving an efficiency of about 75 per cent. Out of this amount to run the furnace, heat the blast, work the blowing engines, hoist the materials and pump water 2,220.94 units would be needed, thus leaving 3,765.8 units that could be employed in other ways.

This calculation has been made on the supposition that steam boilers are used as generators for the work done at the furnace. It must be remembered that steam engines have a maximum thermal efficiency of only 15 per cent. And if under such conditions there is such a residue from the gases for work in other ways, after the work at the furnace is done by them, we can judge of what can be done if these gases run combustion engines, such as gas engines, instead of steam. In gas engines, even for lease gas, the thermal efficiency can safely be taken at 30 per cent. against 15 per cent. in steam engines.

Mr. Gordon puts the matter in another light so as to impress upon the reader the value of the gases which up to the present have been allowed to escape from blast furnaces. In the case of a 300-ton blast

furnace the power not required by the furnace and which would be available for other purposes amounts to 4,223.8 horse-power. The value of that power can easily be calculated. Supposing engines using 1.8 pounds of coal per horse-power hour, and that coal is worth \$2.00 per ton, the value of the above power per annum would then be \$61,095.

When furnace owners realize that by utilizing the gases from their furnaces their coal bill annually will be reduced sixty thousand dollars, we may expect a revolution in the operation of these mills. We shall find that gas-driven engines will provide the blast and work electric generators to provide power and light to all parts of the works; rolling mills will be worked by electricity, and after all this has been done there will be a surplus of energy in the gases which can be farmed out for outside purposes and which will yield a large profit. Hence improved methods will bring a larger profit and prevent the enormous waste of coal consequent upon the old ways.

The feasibility of employing electric motors will become more evident if an improvement lately suggested by Mr. Louis Katona, before the Iron and Steel Institute, be adopted. At present there is an immense waste of energy in rolling mills. The object of the mill is to reduce the cross section of the metal passing through it. It is therefore clear that the only part of the mill doing useful work at any given time is the particular groove through which the metal is passing. All the power required to drive the rest of the mill is wasted. Idle rolls, couplings, gearing and fly wheel are moved to accomplish nothing.

According to the suggest, long rolls with several passes would be done away with and instead there would be a separate pair of rolls for each groove, the rolls being shortened to mere disks. Such short rolls in pairs for forward and backward pass of the metal could easily be driven by electricity and the present great loss of power avoided, for one, two or more pairs could be worked at a time according to the demand.

With such a change in construction and the burning as a source of power of the gases from the blast furnace there would be a complete revolution for the better in the iron industry and a saving of coal. The manufacture of steel requires great purity in the fuel employed and a higher temperature than that obtained from the combustion of ordinary coal. Greater purity is obtained by removing from the coal all the impurities, leaving only almost pure carbon or coke. This is done in coke ovens. The phenomenal increase in the number of such ovens shows the demand for as pure carbon for a fuel as can be obtained. The greater heat is a necessary consequence of the employment of pure carbon in blast furnaces. Be-

cause instead of converting it into carbon monoxide it is completely burned to carbon dioxide. One kilogramme of carbon burned to carbon monoxide generates 2,442 calories, while the same amount burned to carbon dioxide yields 8,080 calories or heat units. Hence the complete combustion gives a higher efficiency. In coking the coal the liquid products are of great commercial value and the gases can be collected and utilized in ways already referred to. In at least one place these gases have been used for motive power. In Seraing, in Belgium, one motor of eight horse-power has been running successfully for some time and two others of twenty horse-power each are in course of construction. The gas from the coke furnace has a thermal efficiency of 4,500 calories per cubic metre or about 500 British thermal units per cubic foot. About 0.8 cubic metre is required per horse-power per hour. Here again we may point out the efficiency of gas engines. A battery of 25 coke ovens producing 40,000 cubic metres of gas in 24 hours would develop 520 horse-power if the gas were burned in a gas engine, while it would develop only 316 horse-power if burned under steam boilers. The pressure of modern competition is forcing the engineer to develop methods for utilizing waste wherever possible.

For condensing steam engines of 200 to 500 horse-power the coal consumption may be safely taken at 4 to 2.2 pounds per effective horse-power hour in actual working. For gas engines under the same conditions and using lean producer gas the fuel consumption is from 1.3 to 1.4 pounds of coal per horse-power hour. Taking the price of coal into account, there is a saving of 40 per cent. in the use of the gas engine. This is the case when the gas is manufactured for the purpose of working a gas engine. If the gas be furnished as a by product of the blast furnace or coke oven the great economy in the use of the gas engine is evident.

EXPORT OF AMERICAN COAL.

For a long time the possibility of American coal entering the English market has been discussed in the newspapers and industrial journals. It is now a fact. American coal has been furnished the London market, the purchaser being the South Metropolitan Gas Company. The consignment was small, but still it is the entering wedge. The question now discussed by those financially interested is whether our coal trade with England will continue and increase or not.

The answer to this question depends entirely on whether we can deliver in English markets our coal at a price to compete with Eng-

lish and Welsh prices in the same markets. In other words, can we sell our coal in England at a price that makes it worth while sending it to England?

Of late the prices have been high in England. This has been due to a combination of causes, but whether the rise is permanent or temporary is not yet clear. No doubt the war in South Africa influenced the rise in price. As a result of this war the South African mines were closed and there was a temporary increased demand at home to supply the transports and troopships. Apart from these causes, is there such an increase in export of coal in England as to indicate that our foreign market is enlarging?

The fact is that now the United States is the largest producer of coal in the world. This may be explained by an increased demand at home. But still it is in some measure due to an increased demand abroad, for while the export in coal has increased in England, still there has been a falling off in the amount used by steamers in the English foreign trade. This last is explained by the larger quantities of cheaper American coal to be had at foreign ports.

Not only do we produce more coal than England, but we can do so at a lower cost. This is due to two facts: First, in this country the coal is more accessible in the mines than in England; and, secondly, there is here a more general use of machinery. It is admitted that in this country we turn out 70 per cent. more coal per man in a year than they do in the British collieries.

While American steam coal as good as the best British can be delivered at our ports of shipment for less than one-half the price per ton, still the cost of transport brings the price of American coal higher in England than that of British coal. This objection to an English market for our coal may be overcome in two ways.

First, there is a claim that the American coal has a higher efficiency as a gas producer. It seems that this was the plea for the placing of the order to which we referred in the beginning. If it is found that the American coal is so much higher in efficiency, that its greater gas production will more than overbalance its higher price, it will be the cheaper in the end, and it is assured of a market in England.

Still, that this market amount to anything, the second difficulty must be met, and its successful solution means the supremacy of American coal in all foreign markets. A present freight of from three to four dollars a ton must be considerably reduced to make export coal business a success. To effect this there is at present a demand for a special class of collier. It must be a vessel of large carrying capacity, low cost of construction, sufficient engine power to steam about eight knots an hour, equipped with the best ma-

chinery for handling cargo, with minimum crew and hence minimum operating expense. This is evidently a vessel especially designed for the coal export trade.

Is such a vessel forthcoming? Shipowners, shipbuilders and coal operators in this country say it is. If so, it will undoubtedly do for the coal trade what the tank steamer has done and is doing for the petroleum trade. To encourage this project the railroads interested are uniting for a reduction in cost of carriage to the seaboard and for better terminal facilities. The Chesapeake and Ohio Coal Company, which controls the Newport News shipbuilding plant, proposes to construct a fleet of colliers, and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company is talking about doing the same thing. If these projects are carried to completion we may feel certain that our export of coal will be vastly increased.

Whether or not we succeed in selling a large amount of raw coal in England, it is certain that the placing of the American consumed product is rapidly increasing and is sure to be a permanent export. Every ton of pig iron exported represents the consumption of from two to two and a half tons of coal; and every ton of rolled iron and steel represents from six to eight tons of coal. But by virtue of proximity to the fuel and ore deposits, advanced methods of manufacture and low railroad rates to the seaboard, the United States is in a position to compete with European manufacturers of iron, in spite of the cost of ocean transport.

The coal question is one not only of individual comfort, but of industrial prosperity and national greatness. There is an ever-increasing burden put upon coal on account of the greater demand for iron and steel, for increased power, electric traction, electric lighting and higher steamship and railway speeds. These demands not only tend to raise the price of coal, but will also necessitate the development of our coal resources to meet this demand and impose more economic methods in the use of coal and develop new methods of utilizing the products resulting from the consumption of coal.

GASEOUS FUEL.

The use of solid fuel in certain branches of industry is attended with many inconveniences, among which is the great amount of waste and the consequent absence of cleanliness. This fact has been strongly emphasized wherever natural gas was found in sufficient quantities to be employed for fuel. Its almost immediate and still continued use proves that it is more satisfactory than solid fuel.

For metallurgical operations, on even a considerable scale, gaseous fuel has been very successfully employed, especially in connection with reverberatory or open-hearth furnaces. The developments in the production of water gas lead to the expectation that there will be a wider application of gaseous fuel in the near future.

To produce gaseous fuel advantage is taken of the fact that carbon dioxide gas is changed to or reduced to carbon monoxide gas by passing the former over red-hot carbon. The *producer* in which this change is effected consists of a deep grate, into which fuel is fed from above, the air entering below the charge. The lower portion of the fuel burns to carbon dioxide, which is reduced to carbon monoxide by the hot carbon at the top of the producer. This gas, *producer gas* as it is called, when collected is not, of course, pure carbon monoxide. It contains the nitrogen of the air, some carbon dioxide and some products resulting from the destructive distillation of the coal. It has a calorific value of about 28,000 gram-units per cubic foot.

A gas more than double this in calorific value can be obtained from the original fuel by converting it into *water gas*. This conversion depends upon the fact that when steam is passed over heated carbon a mixture of hydrogen and carbon monoxide is obtained. In ordinary practice water gas is made by passing steam into a producer which is already at work until the temperature has so far fallen that the steam is no longer decomposed. The fuel is then again brought up to the proper temperature and the operation is repeated. While bringing the fuel to the required temperature by an air blast, producer gas is formed. Water gas is almost entirely made up of hydrogen and carbon monoxide, and hence is practically all combustible. Its calorific value is 74,000 gram-units per cubic foot. But only about 40 per cent. of the calorific value of the coke, which is usually employed in the process, appears in the resulting gas.

Two processes have been devised which give a higher efficiency. They are the Stache and the Dellwik-Fleischer. In the former the fuel employed is usually coal, or a mixture of coal and coke. During the blow the coal is coked. The producer gas resulting is carried to a regenerator and thus a portion of the heat which would otherwise have been lost is conserved. The producer gas in this process may be regarded as a by-product of the water gas generator. As the two gases are delivered separately they can be applied to appropriate uses.

The Dellwik-Fleischer system does not generate producer gas, but aims at burning the fuel completely to carbon dioxide, and this develops greater heat for the decomposition of the steam. That such is the case is clear from the fact that to burn one kilogramme

of carbon to carbon monoxide generates 2,442 calories or heat-units, while burning it to carbon dioxide gives 8,080 calories. In this process a much less depth of fuel is used in the producer and the charge is introduced from the side so as to preserve this depth the more easily. The air pressure is also under control so as to secure the desired combustion. The efficiency of the water gas thus obtained is from 75 to 80 per cent. of the calorific value of the fuel used instead of only 40 per cent. in the case of producer gas. This makes water gas available commercially as a fuel, where before its cost was prohibitive. Some of its advantages may be gathered from a comparison of solid and gaseous fuels for furnace use in manufacturing.

In the case of solid fuel care must be taken of the shape of the furnace and of the manner of firing it, so that the carbon monoxide be formed at the proper point and the desired reducing effect obtained. This result depends on a number of factors, such as the height of column of charge, shape and area of tuyeres, volume and pressure of the blast and manner of charging the ore. Again, where solid fuel is mixed with the charge throughout the furnace an irregularity in the blast or in the arrangement of the materials in the furnace may cause the combustion to creep upwards, burning the fuel not only at a useless point, but at one that is absolutely prejudicial. The presence of sulphur in the present methods with solid fuel is also detrimental.

With the use of water gas these difficulties seem to be obviated. The necessity of regulating the point at which the carbon monoxide is formed is done away with, for the gas is produced outside the furnace and the whole question is the simple controlling of the amount of gas and air admitted. The gas can be burned just where it is required, and the fusion zone confined to desired limits. Hence the possibility of the fire creeping up irregularly through the charge is avoided. The gas is, moreover, a clean fuel and is easily purified from sulphur and its freedom from ash is a benefit in all kinds of smelting.

NOTES.

The Mosquito and Malaria.—The experiment made by Drs. Sambon and Low and referred to in our last "Chronicle," according to published accounts, appears to have been successful. The doctors and their associates, who have been living in a mosquito-proof hut in the Roman Campagna, drinking the water, exposed to the damp

night air and taking no quinine, have so far been free from malaria. On the other hand, Mr. P. Thurburn Mason, who allowed himself to be bitten every second day by infected mosquitoes, fed in Rome, on those suffering from malarial fever, has suffered an attack of fever and what are known as tertian parasites were found in his blood.

In this connection the report of Drs. Reed, Carroll, Agramonte and Lazear, who were appointed last summer by the Surgeon-General to investigate infectious diseases in Cuba, is of interest. It appears, from their report, that in eleven cases in which non-immune individuals were inoculated through the bites of mosquitoes, two attacks of yellow fever followed, and a third attack, which ended in the death of Dr. Lazear, seems directly traceable to the bite of a contaminated mosquito. They think that renewed interest must be excited in the mosquito-theory of the propagation of yellow fever, first proposed by Dr. Finlay, since they have found a typical case of yellow fever, which followed the bite of an infected mosquito, within the usual period of incubation of the disease and under circumstances in which other sources of infection can be excluded.

Molten Wood.—Consul-General Hananer, of Frankfort, reports that M. DeGall, inspector of forests at Lemur, France, has succeeded in melting wood. It is done by means of dry distillation and high pressure. The escape of resulting gases is prevented, and thereby the wood is brought to a molten condition. When cooled it assumes the character of coal, but the organic structure of that mineral is absent. The resulting body is hard, but can be easily shaped and polished. It is impervious to water and acids and is a perfect electrical non-conductor.

Petroleum or Calcium Carbide.—Germany pays the United States annually the sum of twenty-five millions of dollars for petroleum used for the purposes of light and heat. Will this industry with Germany continue? According to the report of the British Consul at Stuttgart, there are at least 200,000 jets of acetylene gas in use in Germany. Thirty-two small towns, with populations up to 5,000, are lighted by acetylene, as well as railway carriages on the German Government lines. The amount of carbide consumed in Germany during the year 1900 reaches 17,000 tons. This is equal in illuminating power to about 7,000,000 gallons of petroleum. Still further preparations are making for the introduction of acetylene as an illuminant, and German capital is invested at home and abroad in the manufacture of the carbide. It is admitted that the petroleum industry is encroached upon most by the use of acetylene. Other American industries, such as petroleum implements, novelty lamps

and oil stoves, will be effected by this change in illumination in Germany.

Wireless Telegraphy.—Much activity is still shown in wireless telegraphy experiments. We learn that Mr. Arthur Gray, in the employ of Mr. Marconi, has arrived at Honolulu, with the intention of putting the wireless telegraph system into operation between the Hawaiian Islands. He has the latest appliances of the Marconi system and is sanguine that it will work successfully. At the same time the news comes that the General Post Office in England is going to purchase the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy. While this report is not confirmed, it is known that a special commission of the Postal Department is preparing to report on the question of its adoption. If the Government takes over the system, it remains to be seen whether it does so merely as a governmental safeguard or with a view of revolutionizing telegraphy. Another point in favor of the wireless system is the fact that Rear Admiral Bradford, Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, recommends the installation of wireless telegraph outfits on all our ships of the navy. A special board had been appointed to watch the working of the system at the yacht races last year and their report was favorable. It is regarded as a practical system of communicating between the ships and between ships and shore stations.

The French War Department has decided to devote \$80,000 to secret experiments in wireless telegraphy, with a view to improving its campaign applications.

A New Welding Process.—This process is the invention of Dr. Goldschmidt, of Essen. The heat required is obtained by means of a new compound which is called "Thermit." It consists of a mixture of metallic oxides with aluminium. Its utility consists in the fact that it permits of a quick and simple production of a fusible mass at high temperatures. By its use rails may be welded at any desired place, and all that is needed is a simple melting-pot. The procedure is thus given: The melting-pot is filled with tar oil to which an inflammable mixture is added. A match serves to ignite it. Small quantities of Thermit are then added, which immediately ignites and a temperature as high as 3,000 C is reached. The incandescent contents of the pot consist of iron, on the top of which floats melted carborundum. An aluminum oxide is then poured on the part of the rail to be welded, and the work is done so rapidly that the melting-pot can be taken in the hand as soon as it is emptied.

Electricity in the Chemical Arts.—The part that electricity plays in
Vol. XXVI.—Sig. 13.

the industries that depend upon the forming and dissolving of chemical compounds is hardly realized by the general reader. Soap-making and paper-making have been largely influenced by the electrolytic manufacture of caustic soda. Calcium carbide, a product of the electric furnace, has given rise to the new acetylene industry. In Italy and Switzerland it is claimed that iron is reduced as a commercial article by the agency of the electric current. A whole new family of substances has been discovered lately, the product of the electric furnace. The members are the cilioids of calcium, barium, strontium and of other alkaline metals. The process of manufacture is so cheap that it is thought that the first member of this family will assume an important position in the industrial world. One of its chief characteristics is that when immersed in water it brings about the evolution of a large quantity of hydrogen. The dyeing industry may profit by the great reducing action of these substances. Electrolytic copper is now a permanent article in the market. We owe aluminium as a commercial article to electricity. Add to this list many of the more expensive drugs which are prepared by electrolytic processes and we can form some idea of the important part electricity plays in the chemical arts.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

SOME NOTES ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE PHILIPPINES. By *Rev. Thomas Cooke Middleton, D. D., O. S. A.* Being Bulletin Number 4 of the Free Library of Philadelphia. Large 8vo, pp. 58, in covers.

All eyes are now turned towards Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines. Students are eager to learn the truth about them. So many conflicting statements have been made in regard to them that it is not easy to tell truth from falsehood. This is more true in regard to the Philippines because they are so far away that very few persons make the journey to them. Even these generally return after a short stay to contradict one another about the country and its inhabitants. The difficulties in the way of the stranger in the Philippines are many, but they do not excuse ignorant, hasty or misleading statements. The people are strange to us, with their peculiarities of origin, tradition, language, dress and custom; and all this should make the writer and speaker from foreign countries more cautious in his statements.

One of the commonest errors in regard to them is the belief that they are ignorant. This is an evil that is very big in American eyes, with its widespread system of public schools. An American will forgive almost anything else before ignorance of book knowledge. He sums up all virtues in secular education, which without moral training is a questionable virtue, indeed.

As the title of Father Middleton's paper shows this accusation against the Philippines is not true. They have a bibliography and an Augustinian priest in America makes this truth known.

A *short* catalogue of Philippine literature, prepared by the bibliographer, W. E. Retama, comprises as many as three thousand separate works. This statement will probably surprise many of the learned who have been weeping over the ignorance of the poor Philipinos and preparing to carry the light of modern civilization to them.

The Philobiblon Club of Philadelphia invited Rev. Thomas C. Middleton, O. S. A., to read a paper before its members on this subject. It was so instructive that its publication was called for. The manuscript was entrusted to one of our newspapers and was lost. In answer to earnest requests from members of the Philobiblon Club, Dr. Middleton rewrote it, but it was destroyed in the Lippincott fire. Again the learned and indefatigable author took up his pen and we have the result of his labor before us, printed by the Free Library of Philadelphia for the use of the students and patrons of the library.

"Our list of Philippina," says our author, "although given merely in outline embraces in its sweep across the literary horizon of that quarter of Malaysia, many works of recognized merit in the several lines of intellectual energy—of history, archæology, ethnology, philology and natural philosophy."

The purpose of the author is stated in these words: "To point out those sources of information anent the Philippine Islands wherein the scholar can best find a general description or history of them, the most trustworthy works on their very varied and multiform languages, as well as other topics cognate with these. Hence these sub-sections into which my paper is split: (1) Works of General Information; (2) Authorities on Philippine Dialects; (3) Some Literary Curios among Philippina; (4) Philippine Presses; (5) Introduction of Printing into the Philippines."

In the development of his subject under these heads Dr. Middleton brings forward a fund of useful information in that clear-cut, concise manner peculiar to the best historians who set fact not fancy before their readers. He deserves a vote of thanks from the public in general, and he will get it from all lovers of truth. He closes with these very striking words about the introduction of printing into the Philippines:

"With no originals at hand, we feel disinclined to pursue this topic further as to the priority of printing in the islands, nor do we care to press the question whether, namely, the first book of Philippine manufacture was Bugarin's dictionary of 1630, Blancas' *Arte* of 1610, or the Lubao *Tratadillos* of 1606.

"In our own colonies (we may observe) printing was introduced, first at Cambridge, in Massachusetts, in 1638; while in Pennsylvania the first book printed—an almanac—by William Bradford, of Philadelphia, is dated 1685, a full half century later, that is, than the introduction of this 'art preservative of arts' into Malaysia."

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. By *Johannes Janssen*. Translated by A. M. Christie. Vols. III. and IV. Herder, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.

We possess in these two volumes, an English translation of the second volume of Janssen's great history, the most important of the entire series, since it contains his masterly exposition of the rise and spread of the Lutheran heresy. It is needless to enter upon a eulogy of Janssen's history; the whole Catholic world is unanimous in pronouncing that he has spoken the last word on the subject of German Protestantism in all its phases; and the Protestant world has paid him the homage of bitter and unreasoning hatred. Under

his well-directed blows the repulsive idol of Saxony lies shattered beyond hope of restoration. The influence of Janssen's work is visible on the pages even of non-Catholic writers; and few there are who still retain the courage to place a halo about the head of the ex-monk of Wittenberg.

Mr. Herder has spared no pains to bring out the books with the beauty and elegance that are characteristic of whatever proceeds from his press.

We cannot, however, say that he has been extremely happy in his choice of a translator. We realize, indeed, that the rendition of a work so erudite and scientific as Janssen's history is no easy task. All the more necessary is it, therefore, that the translation should be carefully overlooked by competent persons. There are many in the country who are able to do this work of revision; we ourselves would be only too glad to give our services gratuitously if called upon. We have gone over the first of these volumes, carefully comparing the translation with the original, and have been obliged to use our blue pencil all too frequently. Some of the translator's mistakes betray a defective acquaintance with the German idiom; others of them evince a sad lack of historical knowledge.

Not wishing to be hypercritical, we shall pass over numerous minor blunders: one blunder, however, we are compelled to denounce in the strongest terms. As every child knows, it has been, during the last four centuries, contended by Protestants, and strenuously denied by Catholics, that the Church in Luther's time openly *sold* indulgences. To our utter amazement, we find this stated, clearly and repeatedly, not by Janssen, but by his bungling translator. On page 78 of Vol. III. we read: "Julius II. had proclaimed a *sale of indulgences* for laying the foundations of the new St. Peter's Church. Leo X. renewed the *sale* in 1514, in order to raise money for the completion of the building, and employed the Minorites to proclaim the Bulls relating to the *sale*." Need we tell the reader that Janssen says nothing of the kind? "Julius II.," he informs us, "had proclaimed an indulgence (*hatte einen Ablass ausgeschrieben*). Leo X. renewed the same (*erneuerte deuselben*) and entrusted to the Franciscans the proclamation of the bulls concerning it (*und übertrug den Minoriten die Verkündigung der betreffenden Bullen*.)" Where is there in this passage the remotest allusion to a *sale* of indulgences? Is this Christie a crypto-Protestant, endeavoring to stultify the great champion of the Catholic religion? With painful reiteration the objectionable phrase recurs page after page.

We can only repeat what we said when we had read the first two volumes of this "translation," that Mr. Herder has been unfortunate in his translator and deserved a better fate. This is all the more

to be deplored since the publisher has done all that in him lay to perform his part of the work with care and diligence.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791. The original French, Latin and Italian texts, with English translations and notes; illustrated by portraits, maps and facsimiles. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites. Vol LXX. All Missions, 1747-1764. 8vo, pp. 318. Cleveland: The Burroughs Bros. Co.

This grand historical achievement is practically completed. The text will be finished in Vol. 71, and the analytical index will fill volumes 72 and 73.

When the publishers made their preliminary announcement many persons must have doubted their ability to carry the project to a successful conclusion. The task which they set for themselves was not an easy one. It was beset with many difficulties, and shrewd bookmen shook their heads doubtingly. Had not these Jesuits Relations been in existence for periods reaching back nearly three hundred years? Had they not been published singly at different times? What interest could they have for any one except a collector, who would pay a high price for them at auction from time to time? Could a sufficient number of persons be found who would give the high figure required to bring out a complete set of the Relations, in an edition limited to 750 copies, with all the original documents printed in French, Latin and Italian, together with the English translation, and printed on sumptuous paper with illustrations? These and similar questions were asked with that peculiar intonation of voice which indicates that only one answer is possible, and it must be spelled with two letters. But the result has justified the foresight of the enterprising publishers. Now, on the eve of completion, we are informed that the work is expected to go out of print in the near future. Only a few sets remain for sale, and these will be quickly bought, because some cautious book lovers will not purchase so important a work until it is nearly or quite completed. It is not likely that it will be reprinted for many years, if ever. The Relations are accessible in their entirety only in the present form, and since the publication of this edition was begun, some of the originals have been destroyed.

Those who wish to possess it should take advantage of this opportunity, because copies will rarely appear in the market in the future, and when they do, will command high prices.

In the volume before us Poitier's account book of the Huron mission at Detroit, which was begun in Vol. 69, is finished. Then follows the official catalogue of the Jesuit order for 1756, in which are named the persons then employed in its North American missions. An unnamed "missionary to the Abnakis" (but known to be Pierre

Roubaud) contributes to *Lettres édifiantes* an account of the capture of Fort William Henry (or George.) The next chapter gives a brief outline, by Etienne de Villeneuve, written in 1762, of the history of the Huron nation and the missions established among them. The suppression in France of the Jesuit order (1761-62) led to similar proceedings elsewhere; and the superior council of Louisiana, by a decree dated July 9, 1763, expelled the Jesuits from that colony. In this volume an account is given of that event and its consequences by one of the exiled fathers. The work is intensely interesting, and at times fascinating. There is a rich mine here for the true Christian novelist.

LIFE OF SISTER MARY GONZAGA GRACE, of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, 1812-1897. By *Eleanor C. Donnelly*. 12mo, illustrated, pp. 334. Philadelphia: St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, Seventh and Spruce streets.

Sister Mary Gonzaga was born in the year 1812; her father died in 1814; her mother died in 1816; she was adopted by Miss Elizabeth Michel, aged 17, a friend of her mother; she was received as a Sister of Charity in 1827; she was sent to Harrisburg in 1828, and to St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum for Girls in Philadelphia in 1830. At that time the Home was on Sixth street, near Holy Trinity Church. In 1832 she nursed the cholera-stricken patients of Philadelphia during the terrible scourge of that year. She and her companions offered their services to the city authorities, and discharged their duty so faithfully as to merit public approval when the scourge had passed.

In 1836 St. Joseph's Asylum was moved to the present site at Seventh and Spruce streets, and in 1843 Sister Mary Gonzaga was made superior. In the following year she and her companion Sisters, with their orphan charges, passed through the reign of terror called the Know-Nothing Riots of 1844, which have left a stain on the history of Philadelphia that cannot be blotted out.

During the War of the Rebellion she presided over the hospital in Camp Satterlee, on the western bank of the Schuylkill river, where thousands of wounded soldiers from the North and South, and of all creeds, were tenderly nursed by the daughters of St. Vincent under her direction. Many of them live to the present day to bless her memory.

After that stormy period had passed she retired again to the quiet walls of St. Joseph's Asylum, to labor faithfully and perseveringly, until the Bridegroom called her on October 8, 1897.

Her body was followed to St. Mary's Church by a great crowd of sorrowing friends and admirers, who wept tears of genuine grief because she whom they loved had been taken from them. She was laid to rest in the churchyard, but her monument was built in Ger-

mantown. It is not a tablet of shining marble nor a shaft of enduring granite, but it is brighter and more lasting than brass or stone. It was most fitting that she who had devoted her whole life to the orphans should continue to protect them after her death. This was made possible by the erection of the Gonzaga Memorial House in Germantown, where the orphan shall find a home under her name.

Miss Donnelly has told the story beautifully. No one could be found better fitted for the work. It was a labor of love for her. Her well-known literary ability, her strong faith, her intimate association with Mother Gonzaga and St. Joseph's Asylum for so many years—all gave to her an equipment which could not be found in any one else. Hence the story of a good life well told.

HISTORY OF AMERICA BEFORE COLUMBUS, According to Documents and Approved Authors. By *P. De Roo*. Two volumes, 8vo, pp. l., 613, and xxiii., 612, with maps. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

The origin of this very important contribution to the history of America is told by the reverend author in these words:

"For several years I searched the Vatican Secret Archives to obtain reliable information regarding the history of one of the Roman Pontiffs, Alexander VI., who is as much slandered as he is little known. While garnering from the richest of historical treasures the most important notes of my study, I happened, once in a great while, to meet with some original and unpublished record pertaining to the religious history of America, either of the time of the Spanish discovery or before it. No wonder if I, an American, considered those documents highly valuable and copied them carefully."

This was the beginning. He soon began to search other libraries and consult other authors to complete the history of the period. He traced the signs of Christianity, which he found in America shortly before the time of Columbus, back to the earliest periods, and then retraced his steps, adding to the evidence already in hand and increasing it at every stage. In this way the story grew, until it arrived at the ample proportions of the two volumes which we see before us.

While the author did not intend to write a history of religion in America before Columbus, the nature of the documents which formed the foundation of the work, gives a religious complexion to it. We must not conclude, however, that the social, civil and political history of the period has been neglected.

The first volume deals with the American Aborigines, while the second treats of European Immigrants. A striking feature of the first volume is a list of all the manuscripts and printed literature consulted, with the names of all the authors quoted. The number is very large. A remarkable feature of the second volume is the series of Catholic bishops on American territory before Columbus. In

both volumes, at the end, copious quotations are made from original documents.

Altogether, Father DeRoo has made a very valuable contribution to American history, and incidentally to the history of Christianity in America. The work entailed enormous labor, while requiring great ability, and the learned author was in every way equal to the task. His book will live as a monument to his learning and zeal.

The publishers have shown a keen appreciation of the value of the work by putting it into splendid form. Indeed, it could not be better done. They inform us that the issue is limited to fifteen hundred copies printed from type. We shall not be surprised to learn in the near future that it has gone out of print. Those who desire to possess it should procure it at once.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST: an Argument. Translated from the French of Mgr. Emile Bougaud by C. L. Currie. 12mo, pp. viii., 159. New York: William H. Young & Co.

In this small volume we have a brief statement of the second volume of Mgr. Bougaud's famous Christian Apology. The original work, written in French, embraced five volumes and appeared in 1874. The author's purpose was to explain Christianity rather than to prove it, because he believed that the number of those who were ignorant of it was far greater than the number of those who were opposed to it. He wrote especially for the present age, and endeavored to show Christianity to the world under a form that would first attract its attention and then win its assent. He was unusually well equipped for such a task. He knew his age well. His learning, piety, oratory and zeal all stamped him as preëminently the man for the work. He noticed that we live in an age when men are very practical—an age of observation, when material things absorb most attention. In order to draw the attention of the world to Christ, instead of speaking to it of His Divinity first and then of His Humanity, which was the method pursued formerly, he invited this practical age to consider the beautiful Humanity of Christ first, and then turn to His divinity. He was encouraged to pursue this course because the Master Himself followed it with doubting Thomas. It succeeded beyond the author's fondest hopes.

Some time after the publication of the original work, Mgr. Bougaud brought the five volumes to Pope Leo XIII. to present them to him. The Pope said to him: "My dear son, I have your work in my library for a long while, and I have annotated every page with my own hand." It is most fitting then that the work of such an author on the Divinity of Christ should be placed before the English-speaking world, side by side with the Encyclical of the Holy Father on the same subject, at the dawn of the twentieth century,

which we are invited to give to the God-Man. Read together, they will surely draw many hearts to that great heart which burst with love for them.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D. Large 8vo. Vol. III. Kir-Pleiades. Pp. 896. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This very important work is nearing completion. The present volume covers three-fourths of the proposed field, and the last volume is promised for next year. It is coming from the press at a very opportune time. The interest in Biblical study was never more general nor the advance in kindred sciences more rapid. A book of this kind must be very well done indeed to merit confidence. The time has passed when a brief summary of some parts of the subject and vague allusions to other parts will satisfy the student. The Bible is so commonly known, we had almost written "well known," that all its claims are scrutinized and questioned. It is so widely discussed that the youngest student challenges its most sacred sentences with as much impudence and irreverence as if they were the utterances of the most ignorant man and not the words of the wisest God. In such an age he must be learned indeed who will teach anything about the Great Book.

The projectors of this Bible Dictionary seemed to have understood this well, for they planned carefully. As to fulness, as to reliability, as to accessibility, the work leaves nothing to be desired, with this qualification, which we have made before and which we must repeat, that no Catholic writer is a member of the editorial staff. This is a serious defect in a work of the kind for Catholics. Many subjects should have been treated by Catholics only; on other subjects the articles should have been revised by Catholics. An illustration of the truth of this assertion may be found in the article on the Blessed Virgin. If the writer had confined himself to the history of the subject, his work would have been incomplete, but not offensive. This is one example: there are many others, for the book embraces the theology of the Bible.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By *Rev. Francis E. Gogot, S. S.*, Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md. 8vo, pp. 606. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This volume is to be followed by two others; one on "Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament," and the other on "Special Introduction to the New Testament." The author tells us that they are the outcome of lectures on these subjects delivered during several years in St. John's Ecclesiastical Seminary, Boston,

and that they are intended chiefly for the use of similar institutions as text-books. So far as we know this is the first time that so complete a course has been prepared in English, and it will be heartily welcomed by the advocates of text-books in the vernacular for our seminaries. Such a book was badly needed. Latin works on the same subject were too profuse for the average seminary course, and English works were too brief. In the present instance the reverend author has found the happy medium. Only a man of his experience and ability could have hoped to succeed. The combination of the two qualities was required. To be able to cover the whole ground in a sufficiently brief manner, and to give to each part its necessary amount of attention, without being obscure, was no easy task. But our author has succeeded. At the same time he has preserved the usefulness of a larger work, to a great extent at least, by numerous references which will enable the more ambitious student to pursue the subject farther.

Additional value attaches to the book because it is up to date. This is a very important characteristic of such a work, and it is shown especially in the appendix which treats of Inspiration. The photographic reproductions of ancient manuscripts is a unique feature. Altogether the book is a very important addition to Catholic Biblical literature, and one that will surely be appreciated.

Stonyhurst Philosophical Series—**PSYCHOLOGY: Empirical and Rational.** By *Michael Maher, S. J.*, Professor of Mental Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. Fourth Edition, rewritten and enlarged. 12mo, pp. xxviii., 602. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The first edition of Father Maher's book appeared in 1890, and it won the highest praise from all critics. So great was its success that the author made only a few verbal changes in the second and third editions. When, however, he began to prepare the present edition, he found that such a large quantity of fresh psychological literature had appeared, especially in America, and he was compelled to make so many additions and alterations that the book has assumed the proportions of a new work. He states his purpose so well that we prefer to let him speak for himself:

"My aim here, as in previous editions, has been not to construct a new original system of my own, but to resuscitate and make better known to English readers a Psychology that has already survived four and twenty centuries, that has had more influence on human thought and human language than all other psychologies together, and that still commands a far larger number of adherents than any rival doctrine. My desire, however, has been not merely to expound, but to expand this old system; not merely to defend its assured truths, but to test its principles, to develop them, to apply

them to the solution of modern problems, and to reinterpret its generalizations in the light of the most recent researches. I have striven to make clear to the student of modern thought that this ancient psychology is not quite so absurd, nor these old thinkers quite so foolish, as the current caricatures of their teaching would lead one to imagine; and I believe I have shown that not a little of what is supposed to be new has been anticipated, and that most of what is true can be assimilated without much difficulty by the old system. On the other hand, I have sought to bring the scholastic student into closer contact with modern questions, and to acquaint him better with some of the merits of modern psychological analysis and explanation."

The work is purely philosophical, and not only every Christian, but every Theist should assent to all that it contains. The first institution to adopt it as a text book, after Stonyhurst College, was a Protestant Theological College in England.

Father Maher has so arranged his text, with different type and different headings, as to make it easier for various classes of readers. He gives the key to this arrangement in the beginning under the title, "Hints on Judicious Skipping." Altogether it is really a wonderful book. Although dealing with a subject that is beset with difficulties for both teacher and student, he has succeeded in making an interesting, clear, concise, yet comprehensive manual.

It will be useful to all English speaking students, but it should be especially acceptable to Americans, who are devoting so much attention to the subject, and particularly in its bearing on education. Certainly every Catholic student who is asked to study psychology should do so with this book at hand.

THE HOLY YEAR OF JUBILEE. An account of the History and Ceremonial of the Roman Jubilee. By *Herbert Thurston, S. J.* Illustrated from Contemporary Engravings and other sources. 8vo, pp. xxiv., 420. St. Louis: Herder.

Here is a very fitting memorial of the Holy Year 1900 and its Jubilee. It is an exhaustive treatise on the subject, tracing its history back to its beginning. The author tells us that he did not intend to publish so comprehensive a history of the Roman Jubilee, but rather a briefer treatise or compilation from well-known authorities. He soon found, however, that the difficulties in the way of a writer who would adapt the language of older jubilee manuals for modern readers were so many and so great that he was forced to permit his book to grow in scope until it has become, practically, an original work. No one will regret the combination of circumstances that brought about such a result, for now we have a work on the subject that is comprehensive and in every way satisfactory.

The book is not controversial at all, and in only one instance does the writer depart from generally accepted authorities. Historians of every school, from Bonanni and Zaccaria to Gregorovius, have agreed in attributing the introduction of the Holy Door ceremonial to Alexander VI. The evidence now for the first time brought together shows that this view is untenable.

Notwithstanding his desire to avoid controversy, the author thought it important to enter a protest against the serious misunderstanding of the phrase *a pœna et culpa*. Two chapters are devoted to the subject. Although the book is historical, it seemed desirable for the sake of completeness to give some account of the practical aspects of the Jubilee.

The illustrations are generally very quaint, but we must remember that they are taken in some instances from very old pictures in the British Museum, and that they are used because of their historical accuracy.

Father Thurston, in his usual able manner, has produced one of the books of the year. One worthy to act as a link between the last year of the nineteenth century and the first year of the twentieth.

ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S LATTER LIFE: from 1856 to 1876. By *Henry F. Brownson*. 8vo, pp. 629. Detroit: H. F. Brownson.

With this volume Mr. Henry F. Brownson finishes the biography of his illustrious father. He was a man who would have stamped his personality on any age. His great mind was not confined to any one art or science, but seemed to include the whole field of knowledge. Philosophy, theology, sociology, politics—all acknowledged him a master. With his great power and splendid equipment he was fearless to a fault and honest beyond question. The life of such a man should be told fully and well. He is worthy of a biographer as great as himself. But intellectual giants are almost as rare as physical ones.

It is fortunate that Mr. Henry F. Brownson took up this work. With the wealth of material at hand, his great sympathy for the subject, and his ability, it has been well done. It forms a very important contribution to American history and particularly to American Catholic history.

D. DIONYSII CARTUSIANI OPERA OMNIA. Tomus X. In Danielelem, et XII., Prophetas Minores. Monstrolii, Typis Cartusiæ Sanctæ Mariæ de Pratis, MDCCCC.

The tenth volume of this admirable edition of a most valuable work leaves nothing to be desired when compared with its predecessors. Beautifully printed, clear and legible, and on good paper, it is worthy of its mission. The old charge, so often refuted, that the Church is opposed to the free study of the Holy Scriptures, is most

effectually answered by the very existence of these fifteen large volumes devoted entirely to the elucidation of the written word of God. A work of this kind, undertaken in the thirteenth century, when, if we may believe some historians, the darkest night were bright as compared to the ignorance that prevailed—undertaken, too, by a monk—stands as a continual reproach to the adversaries of the Church, a monument to the industry and devotion of a class so freely maligned as the monks. Moreover, it should be noted that study sanctified by prayer, as in the case of Dionysius, leads not to the Higher Criticism, so-called, but to a firmer and more reverent acceptance of God's Word in its entirety.

Those who may intend subscribing should do so at an early date. After March 1 the price will be raised from eight to fifteen francs per volume.

HISTORICAL MEMOIRS OF THE CITY OF ARMAGH. By *James Stuart*. New edition revised, corrected and largely rewritten by Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P., S. T. L. Large 8vo, pp. xxiv., 477. Illustrated. Dublin: Brown & Nolan—M. H. Gill & Son.

This notable book first saw the light in 1819. It had been out of print for many years when the present incumbent of the See of Armagh, His Eminence Cardinal Logue, resolved to have it reëdited and reprinted in connection with the great bazaar which had been organized for the benefit of his Cathedral. It was always an important historical work, but in its new form it is really invaluable. At the time when it was first written historical research in that particular field was in its infancy. Since then such rapid progress has been made that instead of a new edition of an old book, we have a new book. Moreover, Mr. Stuart was not a Catholic; he wrote for Protestants principally, and his work could not be acceptable to the Catholic public without many modifications. With this thought in mind, the present work has been done. The author wisely leaves that part of the book untouched which treats of Protestant Primates, except in some minor details of arrangement. For the rest we have practically a new book.

And a very charming book it is, taking us back to the time when St. Patrick built the city and established his see in it, and introducing us to the long line of illustrious men that followed in his footsteps.

It is beautifully made. The type, the paper, the illustrations, all are worthy of the subject. The demand for it should be large.

THE LAST YEARS OF ST. PAUL. By the *Abbe Constant Fouard*. Translated by George F. X. Griffith. 12mo, pp. xiii., 328. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

When the Abbé Fouard finished his work on St. Paul and his Missions he promised another volume which would bring the life of

the great Apostle of the Gentiles to a close. Here it is, gotten up in the same form as the preceding volume, and closing the series of manuals of early Church history on which the author has been engaged for several years. He has had great difficulties to contend with in the present work, because he had to construct a history without historical facts. From the epistles of James, and Jude, and Peter, and the later epistles of Paul himself, slight facts must be gleaned, for they are the only sources available for the student of this period of the Church's infancy.

Rationalistic critics attack even these few documents and try to destroy their authenticity. It is worthy of note, however, that their attacks are weakening. The Christian student is not moved by the sneering objections of the rationalistic school, for he knows that time will vindicate his confidence in the precious documents of the Sacred Scriptures. The pleasure that one experiences when he hears the announcement of the beginning of a good book is very much increased when he hears that it is finished. Such pleasure is ours with Abbé Fouard's last volume before us.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- BRAIN IN RELATION TO MIND.** By *J. Sanderson Christison, M. D.*, author of "Crime and Criminals," etc. 12mo, pp. 143. Chicago: The Meng Publishing Co.
- CITHARA MEA.** Poems by *Rev. P. A. Sheehan*, author of "My New Curate." 12mo, pp. 246. Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.
- TRANSACTIONS OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE.** Vol VI. Semi-Centennial Colonial volume, 1849-1899. Large 8vo, pp. 660. Toronto: Canadian Institute.
- THE CITY FOR THE PEOPLE; or, the Municipalization of the City Governn and of Local Franchises.** By *Frank Parsons*. 8vo, pp. 597. Philadelphia: C. F. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street.
- AN EPITOME OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK.** By *Rev. Nicholas J. Stoffel, C. S. C.*, Professor of Greek in the University of Notre Dame. 12mo, pp. 322. Notre Dame University.
- APOLOGETIK, als Spekulative Grundlegung der Theologie.** Von *Dr. Al. V. Schmid*, 5 Professor der Apologetik an der Universität München. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder; 1900. Price, \$1.60.
- THE WAY OF THE WORLD AND OTHER WAYS.** By *Katherine E. Conway*. Boston: Pilot Publishing Co., 1900.
- AROUND THE CRIB.** By *Abbé Henry Perreye*. New York: W. H. Young & Co., 1900.
- A DAY IN THE CLOISTER.** Adapted from the German of Dom Sebastian Von Oer, O. S. B., by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B. 12mo, pp. xv., 291. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- AT THE FEET OF JESUS.** By *Madame Cecilia*, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent. 12mo, pp. x., 279. London: Burns & Oates.
- DEATH JEWELS.** By *Percy Fitzgerald*. London: Burns & Oates.
- THE SPIRITUAL LIFE AND PRAYER,** according to Holy Scripture and Monastic

- Tradition. Translated from the French by the Benedictines of Stanbrook. 12mo, pp. xxi., 434. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE BEAUTY OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA (Religious Meditations). By the *Rev. Jules Souben*, Professor at the Benedictine Priory, Farnborough. 12mo, pp. vi., 247. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE LIFE OF OUR LORD, written for Little Ones. By *Mother Mary Salome*, of the Bar Convent, York. 12mo, pp. vi., 430. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- LIVES OF THE SAINTS, for children. By *Th. Berthold*. With twelve illustrations. 16mo, pp. 175. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- A TROUBLED HEART AND HOW IT WAS COMFORTED AT LAST. By *Charles Warren Stoddard*. 16mo, pp. 192. Notre Dame, Ind.: Ave Maria Press.
- OXFORD CONFERENCES. Hilary Term, 1900. THE LIFE OF GRACE. By *Raphael M. Moss, O. P.*, Lector in Sacred Theology. 12mo, pp. 146. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- THE CARDINAL'S SNUFF BOX. By *Henry Harland*. 8vo, pp. 319. London and New York: John Lane.
- HIS FIRST AND LAST APPEARANCE. By *Francis J. Finn, S. J.* With illustrations by Charles C. Svendsen. 8vo, pp., 213. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE HOUSE OF EGREMONT. A novel by *Molly Elliott Sewall*. Illustrated by C. Relyea. 12mo, pp. 515. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- RITA. By *Laura E. Richards*. Illustrated by Ethelred B. Barry. 12mo, pp. 246. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.
- SNOW WHITE; or, The House in the Wood. By *Laura E. Richards*. 12mo, pp. 93. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.
- VISITS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*. 24mo. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- NEW MANUAL OF THE SACRED HEART. 24mo. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE PILGRIM'S GUIDE TO ROME. Translated from the Work of M. l'Abbe Laumonier by Charles J. Munich. 24 mo, pp. 242, with map. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- CHATTERBOX. Edited by J. Erskine Clarke, M. A. 1 vol., 8vo, pp. 412. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVI—APRIL, 1901—No. 102.

JUSTINIAN THE GREAT (A. D. 527-565).

PERHAPS the most crucial period of Christian history, after the foundation century of Christ and the Apostles, is the sixth century of our era. Then goes on a kind of clearing-house settlement of the long struggle between Christianity and paganism. It was no false instinct that made Dionysius the Little begin, precisely about the middle of that century, to date his chronology from the birth of Christ, for then disappeared from daily use the oldest symbols of that pagan civil power which had so strenuously disputed with the new religion every step of its progress. The annual consulship was then abolished, or retained only by the Emperor as an archaic title. That immemorial root of Roman magistracy, that thrice-holy symbol of the City's Majestas, could rightly pass away when the City had fulfilled its mission and function in the ancient world. The Roman Senate, too, passed away at the same period—what calls itself the Roman Senate at a later time is a purely local and municipal institution. The old religion of Rome was finally no more than a memory. For the two preceding centuries it had gone on, sullenly shrinking from one strata of society to another, until its last representatives were an individual here and there, hidden in the mighty multitudes of the Christian people of the Empire.¹ The

¹V. Schultze: "Untergang des griechisch-roemischen Heidentums," Jena, 1892, vol. II., pp. 386-389; cf. also pp. 214-215. The documents for the disappearance of paganism are best collected in Buegnot, "Histoire de la destruction du paganisme en Occident." 2 vols. Paris, 1835. Since then it is the subject of many learned works.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

schools of literature, philosophy and rhetoric were no longer en-souled with the principles of Hellenism. Their last hope was buried when the Neoplatonists of Athens took the road of exile to beg from the Great King, that born enemy of the Roman name—the prophet of “Medism”—a shelter and support.² In dress, in the system of names, in the popular literature, in the social institutes, in the spoken language,³ in the domestic and public architecture, in the spirit of the law, in legal procedure, in the character of city government, in the administration of the provinces, in the very concept of the State and of Empire, there are so many signs that the old order passeth away and a new one even now standeth in its place. The symptoms of internal trouble, noted on all sides from the time of Marcus Aurelius and graphically diagnosed by St. Cyprian, had gone on multiplying. They did not portend that decay which is the forerunner of death, as many had thought while the ancient society was dissolving before their eyes,⁴ but that decay which is the agent of great and salutary changes. Their first phase, the long and eventful Wandering of the Nations, had broken up, East and West, the old framework of society as the Greek and Roman had inherited, created or modified it. On the other hand, that most thorough of all known forces, the spirit of Jesus Christ, had been working for fifteen generations in the vitals of this ancient society, disturbing, cleansing, casting forth, healing, binding, renovating a social and political organism that

“Lay sick for many centuries in great error.”

In such periods of history much depends on the ideals and character of the man or men who stand at the helm of a society that is working its way through the straits and shoals of transition. Was it not fortunate for Europe that a man like Charlemagne arose on the last limits of the old classical world, with heart and brain and hand enough to plan and execute a political basis sufficiently strong to hold for centuries to come the new states of Western Christendom?

It is here that Justinian enters on the stage of history and claims a place higher than that of Charlemagne, second to that of no ruler who has affected for good the interests of his fellow-men. He is not, I admit, a very lovable figure. He stands too well within the limits of the Græco-Roman time to wear the illusive halo of Teutonic romance. But in the history of humankind those names shine long-

²Gregorovius, “Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter,” vol. I., p. 58, does not believe that any formal edict was issued by Justinian against the continuance of the pagan schools; they lapsed into desuetude.

³Sic quodcumque nunc nascitur mundi ipsius senectute degenerat, ut nemo mirari deberat singula in mundo deficere cōpisse, cum ipse jam mundus totus in defectione sit et fine. St. Cyprian, “Ad Demetrianum, c. 4, ed. Hartel.

⁴Bury: “The Language of the Romaioi in the Sixth Century,” “History of Later Roman Empire,” II., 167-174; Freeman: “Some Points in the Later History of the Greek Language,” “Journal of Hellenic Studies,” vol. III. (1882); Tozer: “The Greek-speaking Population of Southern Italy,” *ibid* (1889), X., pp. 11-42.

est and brightest which are associated with the most universal and permanent benefits. Is he a benefactor of society who makes two blades of grass to grow where but one grew before? Then what shall we say of one who established for all time the immortal principles of order and justice and equity, without which all human endeavor is uncertain and usually sinks to the lowest level?⁵

I.

Justinian was born in 482 or 483, near Sardica, the modern Sophia and capital of the present kingdom of Bulgaria. The most brilliant of his historians says that he came of an obscure race of barbarians.⁶ Nevertheless, in an empire every soldier carries a marshal's bâton

⁵The principal authority for the life and works of Justinian is the contemporary Procopius, the secretary and lieutenant of Belisarius. In his account of the Gothic, Vandal and Persian wars he exhausts the military history of the empire. His work on the buildings of Justinian, and the *Anecdota* or "Secret History" that bears his name, are entirely devoted to the Emperor, the former in adulation, the latter in virulent condemnation. Agathias, also a contemporary, has left us an unfinished work on the reign of Justinian that deals chiefly with the wars of 552-558. To John Lydus, one of the imperial officers, we owe an account of the civil service under Justinian. Theophanes, a writer of the end of the sixth century, has left some details of the career of the Emperor. The "Church History" of Evagrius and the "Breviarium" of the Carthaginian deacon Liberatus are of first-class value for the ecclesiastical events. His own laws (*Codex Constitutionum* and *Novellæ*) and his correspondence, *e. g.*, with the Bishops of Rome, are sources of primary worth, as are also at this point the "Liber Pontificalis" and the correspondence of the Popes with Constantinople. In his chapters on Justinian, Gibbon followed closely Le Beau, "Histoire du Bas Empire," Paris, 1757-1784. Among the general historians of Greece in the past century who deal with the events of this reign are to be named Finlay, "A History of Greece" from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time (146 B. C. to 1864 A. D.); new and revised edition by H. F. Tozer. Oxford, 1877. 7 vols.; Bury, "A History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene" (395-800). 2 vols. London, 1887. The German histories of Greece by Hopf (1873), Hertzberg (1876-78), Gregorovius (histories of mediæval Rome and Athens, 1889) and the modern Greek histories of Paparrigopoulos (1887-88) and Lambros (1888) cover the same ground, though they differ considerably in method and appreciations. There is an "Histoire de Justinien" (Paris, 1856) by Isambert, very superficial and imperfect, and a life of the Empress by Debidour, "L'Impératrice Théodora" Paris, 1885), to which may be added Mallet's essay on Theodora in the "English Historical Review" for January, 1887. Several essays of Gfrörer in his "Byzantinische Geschichten" (Graz. 3 vol., 1872-77), notably pp. 315-401, are both instructive and picturesque. For all questions of chronology pertaining to the reign of Justinian the reader may consult the classic work of Clinton, "Fasti Romani: The Civil and Literary Chronology of Rome and Constantinople." Oxford. 2 vols., 1845-50 (to A. D. 641); cf. also Muralt, "Essai de Chronographie Byzantine." St. Petersburg. 2 vols., 1855-73, and H. Gelzer, "Sextus Julius Africanus." Leipzig, 1880-1885.

An attempt has been made to collect the Greek Christian inscriptions from the fifth to the eighteenth century. "Inscriptions Grecques Chrétiennes." St. Petersburg, 1876-80, pp. 11-143. Mgr. Duchesne and M. Homolle promise a complete "Corpus." Cf. "Bulletin Critique," 1900, October 5, p. 556. The coins and medals of the period are best illustrated in Schlumberger's "Sigillographie de l'Empire Byzantin," Paris, 1884, a work that rounds out and replaces the earlier treatises of De Saulcy, Banduri, Eckel and Cohen.

⁶It is worth noting that the Slavonic origin of Justinian has lately been called in question by James Bryce, "English Historical Review," II., 657-686 (1887). It is said to have no other foundation than the biography by a certain Bogomilus or Theophilus, an imaginary teacher of Justinian. This biography is not otherwise mentioned or vouched for than in the Latin life of Justinian by Johannes Marnavich, Canon of Sebenico (d. 1639). Bryce holds that Marnavich gives us only echoes of a Slavonic saga about Justinian. Jiricék (Archiv fuer Slavische Philologie, II., 300-304) (1888), condemns the whole story as a forgery of Marnavich. Thereby would fall to the ground all that Alemannus, the first editor of the *Anecdota* of Procopius (1023) writes concerning the Slavonic genealogy, name, etc., of Justinian. Cf. Krumbacher, "Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur." Munich, 1891, p. 46.

in his knapsack, and an uncle of Justinian was such a lucky soldier. Justin I. (518-527) may have been quite such another "paysan du Danube" as Lafontaine describes in one of his most perfect fables. (XI. 6).

"Son menton nourrissait une barbe touffue.
Toute sa personne velue
Représentait un ours, mais un ours mal léché.
Sous un sourcil épais il avait l'œil caché,
Le regard de travers, nez tortu, grosse lèvre:
Portait sayon de poil de chèvre,
Et ceinture de jones marins."

He may have been not unlike the good Ursus in "Quo Vadis," or that uncouth Dacian in "Fabiola." Certain it is that in a long service of fifty years he rose from rank to rank and succeeded with universal consent to Anastasius when that hated "Manichæan" died childless. The peasants of Dacia were no longer butchered to make a Roman holiday—the land had long been romanized, had even furnished the Empire with a succession of strong and intelligent rulers, those Illyrian Emperors whom Mr. Freeman has so magisterially described. Justin was an uneducated barbarian, and cut his signature painfully through a gold stencil plate, as did his contemporary, the great Ostrogoth Theodoric, King of Italy. Yet he had the wisdom of experience, the accumulated treasures of the sordid Anastasius, the counsel of good civil officers, old and tried friends in many an Isaurian, many a Persian campaign. Above all, he had the devotion of his youthful nephew, Justinian. Possible pretenders to the throne were removed without scruple—a principle that has always been prevalent by the Golden Horn. Before Justin died his nephew had reached the command of all the imperial forces, though never himself a warlike man. In 527, on the death of his uncle, he found himself, at the age of thirty-six, sole master of the Roman Empire.

It was no poor or mean inheritance even then, after the drums and tramlings of a dozen conquests. The West, indeed, was gone—it seemed irretrievably. At Pavia and Ravenna the royal Ostrogoth governed an Italian State greater than history has seen since that time. At Toulouse and Barcelona the Visigoth yet disposed of Spain and Southern Gaul. At Paris and Orléans and Soissons the children of Clovis meditated vaguely an Empire of the Franks. The Rhineland and the eternal hills of Helvetia, where so much genuine Roman blood had been spilled, were again a prey to anarchy. Britain, that pearl of the Empire, was the scene of triumphant piracy, the new home of a half dozen Low-Dutch sea tribes that had profited by the great State's hour of trial to steal one of her fairest provinces, and were obliterating in blood the faintest traces of her civilizing presence. Even in the Orient, where the Empire stood rock-like, fixed amid the seething waters of the Bosphorus, the Hellespont and

the Euxine, it knew no peace. The ambition of the Sassanids of Persia threatened the vast level plains of Mesopotamia, while a new and inexhaustible enemy lifted its savage head along the Danube frontier—a vague complexus of Hunnish and Slavonic tribes, terrible in their numbers and their indefiniteness, thirsting for gold, amenable to no civilization, rejoicing in rapine and murder and universal disorder. Justinian must have often felt, with Henry the Fourth, that the wet sea-boy, “cradled in the rude imperious surge,” was happier than the King. Withal, the Empire was yet the only Mediterranean State. Syria and Egypt were its. Asia Minor was faithful. The Balkan provinces, though much troubled, and poor harassed Greece, were imperial lands.⁷ The Empire alone had navies and a regular army, drilled, equipped, officered.⁸ Alone as yet it had the paraphernalia of a well-appointed and ancient State—coinage, roads, transportation, justice, law, sure sanction, with arts and literature and all that is implied in the fair old Latin word *humanitas*. It stood yet for the thousand years of endeavor and progress that intervened from Herodotus to Justinian. And well it was for humanity that its destinies now passed into the hands of one who was penetrated with the keenest sense of responsibility to God and man. Though he reached the highest prize of life before his prime, it has been said of him that he was never young. The ashes of rebellion and insurrection had been smoldering in the Royal City since, with the death of Marcian (457), the old firm Theodosian control had come to an end. The frightful political consequences of the great Monophysite heresy that was born with the Council of Chalcedon (451) were dawning on the minds of thoughtful men. The Semitic and Coptic Orient was creating that shibboleth which would serve it for a thousand years against Greek and Roman—a blind and irrational protest against the real oppressions and humiliations it once underwent. Of its own initiative the Empire had abandoned, for good or for ill, its historical basis and seat—Old Rome. It had quitted the yellow Tiber for the Golden Horn, to be nearer the scene of Oriental conflict, to face the Sassanid with the sea at its back, to create a suitable forum for the government of the world, where Christian principles might prevail, and where a certain inappeasable Nemesis of secular wrong and injustice would not haunt the imperial soul as on the Palatine. But in the change of capital one thing was left behind; perhaps it was irremovable—the soul of Old Rome, with

⁷The political geography of the Empire in the sixth century may be studied in “Hieroclis Synecdemus,” ed. of Gustav Parthey. Berlin, 1866. Here are reprinted the “Notitiæ Episcopatum” or catalogues of ecclesiastical divisions known usually as the “Tactica.” Cf. also Banduri, “Imperium Orientale.” Paris, 1711 (fol.) “Antiquitates Constantinopolitanæ,” *ibid* (fol.) 1729.

⁸Gfrörer: “Byzantinische Studien,” II., pp. 401-436, “Das byzantinische Seewesen.”

all its stern and sober qualities, its practical cast and temper, its native horror of the shifty mysticism of the Orient and the unreality of the popular forms of Greek philosophy. There is something pathetic in that phrase of Gregory the Great, "The art of arts is the government of souls. It is like an echo of the sixth book of Vergil, "Tu vero, Romane, imperare memento."

Perhaps this is the germ of solid truth in the legend that Constantine abandoned the civil authority at Rome to Pope Silvester. He certainly did abandon to the oldest and most consistent power on earth, a power long since admired by an Alexander Severus and dreaded by a Decius, that rich inheritance of prestige and authority which lay embedded in the walls and monuments of ancient Rome. Within a century something of this dawned on the politicians of Constantinople and lies at the bottom of the long struggle to help its bishop to the ecclesiastical control of the Orient. In history there are no steps backward, and we need not wonder that Dante, the last consistent, if romantic, prophet of the Empire, was wont to shiver with indignation at the thought of the consequences of this act.

But if they lost the genuinely Roman soul of government they gained a Greek soul. It was an old Greek city they took up—Byzantium. Its very atmosphere and soil were reeking with Hellenism, whose far-flung outpost it had long been. History, climate, commerce, industries, the sinuous ways of the sea, the absence of Roman men and families, the contempt for the pure Orientals, forced the Emperors at Constantinople from the beginning into the hands of a genuine local Hellenism that might have shed its old and native religion, but could not shed its soul, its immortal spirit. Henceforth the world was governed from a Christianized Hellenic centre.* This meant that government for the future was to be mingled in an ever increasing measure with metaphysics; that theory and unreality, the dream, the vision, the golden hope, all the fleeting elements of

*"The Greek characteristics of the Empire under Justinian are calculated to suggest vividly the process of ebb and flow which is always going on in the course of history. Just ten centuries before Greek Athens was the bright centre of European civilization. Then the torch was passed westward from the cities of Hellenism, where it had burned for a while, to shine in Latin Rome. Soon the rivers of the world, to adopt an expression of Juvenal, poured into the Tiber. Once more the brand changed hands; it was transmitted from the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, once more eastward, to a city of the Greek world—a world, however, which now disdained the impious name 'Hellenic' and was called 'Romaic.' By the shores of the Bosphorus, on the acropolis of Græco-Roman Constantinople, the light of civilization lived pale, but steady, for many hundred years—longer than it had shone by the Ilissus, longer than it had gleamed by the Nile or the Orontes, longer than it had blazed by the Tiber, and the Church of St. Sophia was the visible symbol of as great a historical idea as those which the Parthenon and the temple of Jupiter had represented, the idea of European Christendom. The Empire at once Greek and Roman, the ultimate results to which ancient history, with Greek history and Roman, had been leading up was for nine centuries to be the bulwark of Europe against Asia, and to render possible the growth of the nascent civilization of the Teutonic nations of the West by preserving the heritage of the old world." Bury: "History of the Later Roman Empire," II. 39.

life, were to have a large share in the administration of things civil and ecclesiastical. Government was henceforth

"Sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

Cato, it is said, chased the Greek philosophers from Rome. They one day mounted the throne in their worst shape, the shape of the sophist, in the person of Marcus Aurelius; but, indeed, they had no proper place in Rome, where government has always tended to keep its head clear and calm, with eyes fixed on the actual interest, the average practical and attainable. Not so in the Greek Orient. With the triumph of the Christian religion the gods of Hellas fell from their rotten pedestals. But they were never the governing element, the *principe générateur* of the Greek life. That was the individual reflective mind, eternally busy with the reasons of things, seeking the why and the how and the wherefore, not for any definite purpose, but because this restless research was its life, its delight; because at bottom it was highly idealistic and despised the outer and visible world as an immense phenomenon, a proper and commensurate subject for the frightful acidity of its criticism.

It is the metaphysical trend and spirit of these *opiniosissimi homines* of Greece which begat the great heresies of Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius and Eutyches—all Greeks. They even partially conquered in their defeat, for they compelled, to some extent, a philosophical refutation of their own vagaries; they helped Plato, and later Aristotle, to their high seats in Christian schools. With sure instinct the earliest Christian historians of heresies set down among them certain phases of Greek philosophy. "*Quid Academiæ et Ecclesiæ!*" cries Tertullian in his book on Prescription, as though he smelled the battle from afar.

In the intense passion of the Arian and Christological discussions the highest Greek gift, metaphysics, and the finest Greek training, dialectics, came to the front. In every city of the Greek world the most abstruse and fine-drawn reasoning was indulged in habitually by all classes. The heresy of Arius had surely its obscure origins among those third century philosophers of Antioch who gave to that school its grammatico-literal and rationalizing trend. He appeared at Nicæa in the company of pagan philosophers, and when defeated carried his cause at once before the sailors and millers and wandering merchants along the sea-front at Alexandria. And for two centuries the shopkeepers and shoemakers of Constantinople and Alexandria would rather chop logic than attend to their customers. For the victories of the mind the burdens of the State were neglected or forgotten, or rather a metaphysical habit of thought was carried into the council chamber, to prevail therein very often to the detriment

of the commonwealth. The great officers of the State were too often doubled with theologians. The Emperor himself took on gradually the character of an apostolic power, with God-given authority to impose himself upon the churches, formulate creeds, decide the knottiest points of divinity, make and unmake bishops great and small, and generally to become, in all things, a visible providence of God on earth.¹⁰ This is what the Eastern world acquired by losing its Roman Emperors and gaining a succession imbued with the spirit of Hellenic thought and accustomed to the exercise of despotic power in a city that had no old and stormy republican traditions, being no more than the high golden seat of imperial authority from its foundation. Were it not for the magnificent resistance of Old Rome in her Leos and her Gregorys, the Oriental bishops would have allowed the cause of Christianity to become identified with the Cæsaropapism of the Emperors.

If we add to the loss or absence of desirable Roman qualities on the part of these great governors of imperial society, and the acquisition of undesirable Greek qualities, certain influences of the Orient, we shall, perhaps, better understand the situation in which Justinian found himself. It was noted very early that in contact with the Orient the extremely supple and impressionable Greek genius suffered morally. It lost its old Dorian or Argive independence, and, stooping to conquer, took on the outward marks of servitude while dwelling internally in its own free illimitable world of opinion and criticism. Long wars, commerce, travel, especially prolonged sojourns in corrupting Persia, had habituated the Eastern Greeks to political absolutism. Since Alexander the habits of servile subjection of their own conquered populations of Syria and Egypt were influential in this direction. The Roman Emperors from Diocletian on were themselves caught by the externals of the Great King's court, and seem to have transferred much of its ceremonial to their own. The presence in Constantinople of a great multitude of miscellaneous Orientals and the exaggeration of style and rhetoric peculiar to this, as to all other times of decadence, added strength to these influences.

II.

The great problem that faced Justinian on his accession was the *very character and limits* of the Roman State for the future. Were the encroachments of one hundred years, the extinction of the Imperium in the West, to be finally condoned to those victorious Germans who in the last century had absorbed the political control of

¹⁰Cf. Rambaud, "L'Empereur Byzantin," "Revue des Deux Mondes." 1891.

Italy, Gaul, Africa, Spain, Sicily? Or should an effort be made to reëstablish again an *orbis terrarum*, the ancient world-wide cycle of imperial authority? Should Carthage, Milan, Ravenna, Trier, Rome itself, be forever renounced, or must one last struggle be made to win back the Cradle of the Empire and the scene of its first conquests? Every possible argument pointed in an affirmative sense—the *raison d'Etat*, the religious considerations and influences, the demands of commerce and industry, the incredibly strong passion of sentiment evoked by the memories and glory of Old Rome. In the heart of Justinian burned the feelings of a Cæsar and a Crusader, a great trader and carrier of the Royal City and a Hellene scandal-stricken at the overflow of barbarism and “Medism” that was fouling all the fair and sweet uses of life. In the person of Belisarius he found a great general, one of the most intelligent and resourceful men who ever led troops into action. He found also for Belisarius a secretary, Procopius, who has left us a brilliant record of the great campaigns by which the ancient lands of the Empire were won back. For twenty-five years the world of the Mediterranean resounded with the din of universal war. Around the whole periphery of empire went on the work of preparation, a thousand phases of mortal conflict, a thousand sieges, truces and bloody battles. Belisarius broke the short-lived and fanatic Vandal power in 531, and Carthage, so dearly bought with Roman blood, was again a Roman city. Justinian lived to see the heroic resistance of the Ostrogoths made vain, after the death of their great King, by the total subjugation of Italy and its re-incorporation with the Empire. In the meantime the great corn granary of the Empire, Sicily, was won back, and the constant fear of famine that hung over Constantinople and the army disappeared. Scarcely had he relief in Africa or Italy when the Emperor moved his troops to the plains of Mesopotamia or even to the rocky fastnesses of Colchis, the modern Georgia, chastening at once the proud Mede and the wild, fierce shepherds of inaccessible hills. With the exception of the Persian campaigns, these wars ended successfully for the Roman State. One last outpouring of Teutons—the long advancing Lombards—wrenched away Northern Italy from the immediate successor of Justinian and interposed a hopeless barrier against any attempts to reconquer Austria, Switzerland and Bavaria. But Central and Southern Italy were saved. A prætorian perfect was set over Northern Africa; Sardinia and Corsica were once more integrant portions of the great Mediterranean State. A prætor again governed in Sicily as in the days of Cicero. From the inaccessible marshes of Ravenna an exarch or patrician ruled the remnants of the Roman name in the original home of that race. Even in Spain Justinian recovered a footing, and several cities

of the coast recognized again the authority that had so long civilized the Iberian peninsula.

Doubtless it was owing to the frightful exigencies of the Persian wars that Northern Europe swept finally out of the immediate vision of the Emperor. The men, ships, moneys and efforts of all kinds that it took to carry on these long and costly and unsatisfactory campaigns against the Persian could well have availed to reunite the lost lands of the North and to make the Rhine and the Danube again Roman rivers. The interest in the island of Britain grew so faint that it appears in Procopius only as the home of innumerable spirits, a vast cemetery of ghosts ferried over nightly from Gaul by terrified mariners who are chosen in turn and compelled by supernatural force.¹¹

The Frank went on absorbing at his leisure the Rhineland, Switzerland, Bavaria, Southern Gaul, and threatened to sweep Spain and Northern Italy into his State.¹² Indeed, out of the fragments that escaped Justinian and Belisarius the greatest of the Frankish race, the mighty Karl, would one day resurrect the Roman Empire in the West. If Justinian did not recover all the Western Empire, at least he brought to an end the Germanic invasions by exterminating Vandal and Ostrogoth and reestablishing in the West some formal and visible image of the old Roman power and charm. Henceforth Thuringians, Burgundians, Alemans, Visigoths, Suevi, Alans, the whole Golden Horde of tribes that first broke down the bounds of the Empire, tend to disappear, submerged in the growing Frankish unity. The one unfortunate race that came last—the Lombards—was destined to be utterly broken up between the three great Western powers of the two succeeding centuries, the children of Pepin Heristal, the Byzantine exarchs of Italy, and the bishops of Rome. Could Justinian have kept the line of the Danube free and secure, the course of mediæval history would surely have been changed. This was the original weak spot of the Empire, and had always been recognized as such. Trajan tried to romanize the lands just across it—the ancient Dacia—but his successor, Marcus Aurelius, had to withdraw. An inexhaustible world of miscellaneous barbarians—an *officina gentium*—was at the back of every frequent rebellion, and their warriors were like the leaves of the summer forest. Here, too, was the fateful margin of empire along which broke eventually the last surges of every profound social or economic disturbance of the far Orient, flinging across the great river in wild disorder Hun and Slav and Avar and Gepid and Bulgar. The first

¹¹Nothing could illustrate more forcibly the thoroughness of the decadence of the old Roman power in the West than the presence in Procopius of this curious survival of old Druidic lore. Cf. Edouard Schuré, "Les Grandes Légendes de France." Paris, 1892, p. 154.

¹²Gasquet, "L'Empire Byzantin et la Monarchie franque." Paris, 1888. Lecoy de la Marche, "La Fondation de la France au V. et VI. siècles." Paris, 1893.

encroachments on Roman life and security culminated, after a century of warfare, in the ever memorable campaigns and retreats of Attila. And when the Empire of the mighty Hun fell apart at his death the Germans, Slavs, Bulgars, and other non-Hunnic tribes whom he had governed from his Hungarian village, took up each its own bandit life and divided with the Hunnic tribes the wild joys of annual incursions into those distracted provinces that are now the peaceful kingdoms of the Balkans and Greece, but were then Illyricum, Moesia, Thrace, Thessaly, Macedonia, Epirus. The Avars and the Huns, remnants perhaps of the horde of Attila, were the most dreaded in the time of Justinian. But they only alternated with the Slavs, to whom they gave way within a century, so endless was the supply of this new family of barbarism. These latter were tall, strong, blond, with ruddy hair, living in rude hovels and on the coarsest grain, fiercely intolerant of any rule but that of the father of the family, jealous and avaricious, faithless like all barbarians, yet child-like in their admiration for power and grandeur. They harassed yearly the whole immense peninsula of the Balkans. They climbed its peaks, threaded its valleys, swam its rivers, a visitation of human locusts. The regular armies of Justinian were of no avail, for these multitudes fought only in ambuscade, a style of warfare peculiarly fitting to the Balkans, which are like the "Bad Lands" of Dakota on an immense scale. They shot from invisible perches poisoned arrows at the Romans, and at close quarters were dread opponents by reason of their short and heavy battle-axes. It was in vain that line within line of fortifications were built, that in isolated spots the watch-towers and forts were multiplied and perfected, that every ford and pass and cross-road had its sentry boxes and castles. The enemy had been filtering in from the time of Constantine,¹³ and was already no small element of the native population. So, as German had called to German across the Rhine, Slav called to Slav across the Danube; the Romans were caught between the hammer and the anvil, between the barbarian within and his brother from without. Nevertheless it was not without a struggle that filled four centuries more that Constantinople let go her mountain bulwark. Every river ran red, and every hillside was drenched with blood, in that memorable contest, in which she sometimes saw from the walls of the Royal City the plains of Thrace one smoking ruin, and again all but cut off, root and branch, her Slavonic and Bulgarian enemies.¹⁴

¹³O. Seeck, "Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt," vol. I. Berlin, 1897. Part II., c. 6. "Die Barbaren im Reich," pp. 391-548.

¹⁴The influence of Constantinople in the later Slavonic world is incontestable. Beside the "Chronicle of Nestor" (French translation by L. Leger. Paris, 1884), cf. Gaster, "Græco-Slavonic," London, 1887; Rambaud, "La Russie Epique," Paris, 1876; Krek, "Einleitung in die Slavische Literatur-geschichte," Graz, 1887, pp. 451-473, and the pro-Byzantine work of Lamansky (in Russian) "On the Historical Study of the Græco-Slavonic World," St. Petersburg, 1871.

Doubtless the heart of Justinian was sore pressed at his impotency against the swarming Slavs and Avars. He loved his Illyrian home and built on the site of his native village a city, Justiniana Prima (near Sofia), which he fondly hoped would be a new Byzantium in the Balkans. With a foreconscious eye he made it a bishopric, even a patriarchate, and ordered for it honors second only to those of the most ancient sees of the Christian world. This act was productive of grave consequences in later times that fall beyond our present ken.¹⁶

The long wars of Justinian with Persia were otherwise important. Here it was a death struggle between Persia striving to reach the sea and Constantinople struggling to keep her back. These wars lasted more or less continuously from 528 to 562, and sometimes coincided with the greatest expeditions in the West. From time to time a peace was concluded or a truce—the peaces were really only truces. The usual result was the payment of a heavy tribute on the part of the Emperor, amounting at times to as much as a million dollars, not to speak of the smaller sums paid by the cities of Mesopotamia or Syria, and the incalculable treasures carried off in each of these campaigns. If the Persian resented new fortifications in the vicinity of the Euphrates, war was declared. If the Saracen Sheikhs who stood with the Romans fell into a dispute with their brethren who served Persia over a desert sheep-walk, it was settled by a long war between the Romans and the Persians. Endless sieges of fortified cities, heavy ransoms from pillage and burning, extraordinary single combats, marching and counter-marching across Syria and Mesopotamia, fill the pages of the historians. The local Jews and Samaritans, yet numerous and powerful, were no small source of weakness to the Romans. So, too, were the ugly heresies of the Monophysites and Nestorians, with all the hatreds and heart burnings they occasioned against Constantinople, the protectress of the orthodox faith of Chalcedon, a general council almost universally misunderstood and equally hated in Syria and Egypt. In 532, for example, Justinian purchased peace for eleven thousand Roman pounds of gold (about two and a half millions of dollars). He was then in the throes of the Vandal war in Africa and on the point of the expeditions against the Moors and to recover Sicily. When Belisarius was in the very heart of the Gothic War in Italy, Chosroes again broke the peace, solicited by Witigis, the head of the Gothic forces, and joined by many dissatisfied Armenians, who considered themselves oppressed by the Romans—perhaps, too, embittered by the persecution directed against the Monophysites.

In their own way these wars are of value for the history of military

¹⁶Duchesne, "*Les Eglises Séparées.*" Paris, 1897.

engineering. Great and ancient cities fall before the engineers of Persia. Antioch, the Queen of the East, for the second time saw a Persian King within her walls. Chosroes even reached the shores of the Mediterranean, gazed on the great Midland Sea, bathed in its blue waters, and on its shores offered to the sun the sacrifice of a fire-worshipper. He had strong hopes of reaching and conquering Jerusalem and of bringing all Syria under his yoke, but desisted therefrom. Internal disorders and the plague seem to have held him back. The last phase of these Persian wars was unrolled at the extremity of the Black Sea, among the Lazi, in old Greek Colchis, the Land of the Golden Fleece, now Mingrelia and Georgia. The people were Christians and under an uncertain Roman protectorate. But they abutted on an unruly portion of the Persian Empire, and so were a thorn in the side of Chosroes. Moreover, he had long desired a footing on the Black Sea, whence he could create a navy that would place Constantinople at his mercy and permit him to come into easy contact with those Huns and Slavs and Avars who from the mouths of the Danube and the plains of Bessarabia and Southern Russia were harassing the Royal City. Hence the great importance of the long and weary struggle for the wild and barren hills of the Caucasian seashore. They were doubly important, because these narrow passes could keep back or let in the trans-Caucasian Scythians and create a new source of ills for a state groaning already under a complication of them. In the end the Persian was shut out, chiefly because the population was Christian and unsympathetic to him, but not without a war of seven years' duration, filled with romantic episodes and revealing at once all the weaknesses and also the strong points of the Roman military system. The victory, as usual, cost a notable sum of money. Justinian agreed to pay about one hundred thousand dollars yearly for fifty years, of which nearly a million dollars had to be paid down at once. Nevertheless, he kept the Persians from becoming a naval power and from undertaking the anti-Christian propaganda that a century later fell to the yet despised Arabs and Saracens who were serving in both armies, unconscious that on the great dial of time their hour was drawing nigh.

For the thirty-eight and odd years of his reign the Emperor was never free from care as to the existence and limits of the State. It was no ordinary merit to have provided for the defense of the common weal in all that time, to have recovered a great part of what his predecessors had lost, to have restored the prestige of the Empire over against Frank and Ostrogoth, to have kept Persia in her ancient limits, and to have saved the Royal City from the fate of Old Rome, which had fallen before the first onslaught of Alaric. No doubt he

had able generals, Belisarius, Bessas, John the Armenian, Dagisthæus, Wilgang and others. It was an age of mechanical inventions and engineering skill, the result of good studies among the ancient books and also of new needs and experiences.¹⁶ The peculiar character of the barbarian wars and the multitude of old populous cities through the Roman Orient gave opportunity for the development of fortifications. By this means chiefly, it would seem, the Emperor hoped to withstand the attacks of his enemies.

III.

The armies of Justinian were recruited on pretty much the same principle as those of his predecessors. Since Diocletian and Constantine, conquered barbarians had become the mercenaries of the Empire and received regularly as wages the gold which they had formerly extorted by the irregular and uncertain methods of invasion and plunder. Isauria in all its inaccessible strongholds became a *pepinière* of soldiers for the Empire just as soon as it had been demonstrated to these untameable hill-folk that Constantinople would no longer tolerate their impudent independence. The Catholic "Little Goths" of Thrace were good for many a recruit.

The disbanded and chiefless Heruli, ousted from Italy by Theodoric, were at the disposition of the Emperor. Sometimes the barbarians came in as *foederati*, or as "coloni," half-soldiers, half-farmers. Sometimes they rose to the highest offices by bravery and intelligence, like a Dagisthæus, a John, a Wilgang, a Guiscard, five hundred years ahead of that other Guiscard who was to behead in Constantinople itself the successor of Justinian. It was a heyday for all the barbarian adventurers of the world. Never since the palmy days of Crassus and Cæsar and Antony and Germanicus was there war at once so grievous and widespread, so varied in its fields of battle and claiming so much endurance, ingenuity and industry. Then was in demand all that the art of sieges had gained since the Homeric pirates sat down before some lone Greek trader on his isolated perch in the Ægean. If Shakespeare's Welsh Captain could read of the famous sieges of Daras and Edessa, his soul would go up in flame for joy at these wars carried on with all the science of a dozen Cæsars. Trench and counter-trench, wall and parapet, ditch and mine, tower and rampart, battering ram and beam and wedge—a hundred industries were kept going to lay low the huge

¹⁶In the "Varie" of Cassiodorus are found many curious contemporary traces of the survival of the ancient skill in engineering and architecture. Cf. the formula (VII., 6) for the appointment of a Count of the Aqueducts, and (VII., 15) for the appointment of an "Architectus operum publicorum." "Let him consult the works of the ancients, but he will find more in this city (Rome) than in his books." The "Letters of Cassiodorus" are translated by Thomas Hodgkin. London, 1886.

fortifications of monolith and baked brick that dotted the land of Eastern Syria and Mesopotamia. Indeed, it was by his enormous system of fortifications that the great Emperor assured the restored peace of his domains.

It is true, as Montesquieu has said, that "France was never so weak as when every village was fortified." Yet under the circumstances this was the only immediate remedy against countless enemies from without and within ceaselessly plotting the ruin of the venerable old State. The best national defenses are those which we can most easily set up and most strongly defend, not what the theorist or philosopher of war can suggest. From Belgrade to the Black Sea, from the Save to the Danube, citadels with garrisons and colonies were located and provided with weapons of defense and attack. In Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Thessaly over 600 forts were established for observation and resistance. Many of them, perhaps, were such watch-towers and lonely barracks as we yet see in the Roman Campagna, whither the shepherd and his herd could turn for a momentary refuge from marauders.

All the scum of the Northeastern world was floating loosely over the plains of Southern Russia, faintly held back by the Greek cities of the Crimea. The peninsula of Greece was particularly open; the unwarlike character of its thin population was patent since Alaric had burned and pillaged his way across it in all directions early in the fifth century. Since then its woes are best described by dropping a black pall across the annals of one hundred years.

"The centre of earth's noblest ring"

was a howling desert, save for a few cities in which, perhaps, the old Greek blood was propagated, and some spark of the philosophic mind nursed against a better day.¹⁷ The pass of Thermopylæ was again fortified and garrisoned. The Isthmus of Corinth was strengthened as a buffer for the wild Peloponnesus, half-heathen as it still was in its remotest valleys and hillsides.

The long wall of Thrace that protected the kitchen-garden suburbs of Constantinople was strengthened, not so well, however, that irregular bands of Huns, Avars and Slavs did not regularly break through and insult the holy majesty of the Empire with their barbarian taunts that mingled with the flames of costly churches and municipal buildings and with the cries of the dying and the out-

¹⁷If we go to look in modern Greece for pure and unmixed Hellenes, untainted by any drop of barbarian blood, that we assuredly shall not find. . . . The Greek nation, in short, has, like all other nations, been affected, and largely affected, by the law of adoption. . . . The Slavonic occupation of a large part of Greece in the eighth and ninth centuries is an undoubted fact, and the Slavonic element in the population of Peloponnesos may be traced down to the time of the Ottoman conquest." Freeman, "Mediæval and Modern Greece," *op. cit.*, pp. 340-341.

raged. As we peruse these annals it is hard to keep back a tear and a shudder, and we comprehend the preternatural gravity that hangs about every coin and effigy of Justinian. To him it must have seemed as if the original sanctity of order, the rock basis of society, were tottering to its fall. Alas! he could not see that those flames which lit up the Propontis and the Isles of the Princes,¹⁸ which fell across the site of ancient Troy and the original homes of Dorian and Ionian merchants, were not the awful illumination of a "Night of the Gods," but the dawn of our modern society.¹⁹ In such pangs and throes does social man usually reach his highest place, his highest calling on this sad footstool of earth!

Though the quasi-extirpation of Isauria by Anastasius gave peace on the mainland of Asia Minor, Justinian was obliged to protect that vast heart of the Empire, with all its superimposed and ancient civilizations, by great walls towered and flanked at intervals from the Crimea to Trebizond on the Persian frontier, a stretch of five hundred miles. The Iberian and Caspian Gates, those narrow sea margins and mountain throats that control the entry to the Black Sea from the steep ranges of Caucasus, had also to be fortified, or, rather, the strong hand of the Emperor must compel the rude mountain chiefs to render to him as well as to themselves this necessary duty. The very sources of the Euphrates, forever a dark and bloody line of battle, had to be secured against the feudal satraps of the Great King. In the Mesopotamian plain Amida, Constantine, Nisibis, holy Edessa, must rise up clad with impregnable armor and filled with warlike men. Restless, unsympathetic, proud, discontented, abused Armenia—the torture of Rome since the days of Mark Antony and still the plague of statesmen—must be fastened

¹⁸ Schlumberger, "*Les Iles des Princes*." Paris, 1884.

¹⁹ The first chief who fenced in the Palatine with a wall did not dream that his hill-fortress would become the head of the world. He did not dream that it would become the head of Italy or even of Latium. But the prince who fenced in the New Rome, the prince who bade Byzantium grow into Constantinople, did design that his younger Rome should fulfil the mission that had passed away from the elder Rome. He designed that it should fulfil it more thoroughly than Milan or Trier or Nikomedia could fulfil it. And his will has been carried out. He called into being a city which, while other cities have risen and fallen, has for fifteen hundred years, in whatever hands, remained the seat of imperial rule; a city which, as long as Europe and Asia, as long as sea and land keep their places, must remain the seat of imperial rule. The other capitals of Europe seem by her side things of yesterday, creations of accident. Some chance a few centuries back made them seats of government till some other chance may cease to make them seats of government. But the city of Constantine abides and must abide. Over and over again has the possession of that city prolonged the duration of powers which must otherwise have crumbled away. In the hands of Roman, Frank, Greek and Turk her imperial mission has never left her. The eternity of the elder Rome is an eternity of moral influence; the eternity of the younger Rome is the eternity of a city and fortress fixed on a spot which nature itself had destined to be the seat of the empire of two worlds. Freeman, "*The Byzantine Empire*" in "*Historical Essays*," III., series, 1892, p. 255. On the city of Constantinople besides the classic description of Hammer in his "*Geschichte der Osmanen*" there are for modern times the books of De Amicis, Grosvenor and Hutton; for the Middle Ages the "*Esquisse topographique*" of Dr. Mordtmann, Lille, 1892; for the early Middle Ages "*Constantinopolis Christiana*" (fol.) 1729, and Riant, "*Exuviae Sacrae Christianae*," Genève, 1877, 2 vols.

once more, however unwillingly, to the body of the Roman State.

In the whole Orient rose up one hope of victory, one sure refuge, the great Gibraltar of Daras. One hundred years had Rome toiled at that barrier against Persia. Only the incessant wars in Italy and the Mediterranean prevented Justinian from making it the capital of Roman power in the Orient. As it was, Daras was the chief thorn in the side of Persia, a living monumental insult pushed far into the lands that the Great King looked on as his hereditary domain, and an encouragement to all his own rebels as well as a promise to the thousands of unattached Saracens, the Bedouins of those grassy deserts, on whose surface we now look in vain for traces of the greatest fortress that Greek genius ever constructed.

Egypt, too, the land of the wheat-bearing and gold-producing Nile, needed the assurance of fortifications against the hordes of Ethiopia and Nubia and inner unexplored Africa, against the tribes of the Soudan, who from time immemorial, under many names, waged war against civilization on its oldest, richest and narrowest line of development.

Justinian never forgot the arts of diplomacy in the midst of all these warlike cares. He was always willing to pacify by tribute the various broken bands of Huns. This had been always one line of imperial policy, even in the palmy days of a Theodosius the Great. Much was always hoped from the internal discords of the barbarians, who often dissipated their strength in orgies and self-indulgence. One tribe was played off against the other by arousing avarice. The Goths, for instance, hated the Franks and the Alemans, so they were willing to exterminate 75,000 of the latter, who might have helped them to cast out thoroughly the Roman power. The Emperor encouraged the King of Abyssinia against the King of the Homerites in Southern Arabia, and made thereby a useful Christian friend, while he broke up an anti-Christian Jewish power. He took in as a body of auxiliary troops the Heruli of Italy, so brutal and stupid that nobody would have them as neighbors. He gave the Crimea to three thousand shepherd Goths and cultivated the principal men among the Tzani, the Armenians, the Lazi of Colchis. Chosroes could say in 539 that soon the whole world would not contain Justinian, so happy seemed his fortunes about that date. Yet he could also taste the cup of despair, for in 558 he was obliged to witness a small body of wild Huns come up to the very gates of the Royal City, an advance guard of other hordes that were pillaging Thrace and Greece. The aged Belisarius could find only three hundred reliable soldiers in a city of one million inhabitants; yet with them he scattered these Huns and saved the city.

The old historian Agathias tells us that there should then have been in the army six hundred and fifty-five thousand fighting men, but it had dwindled down to one hundred and fifty thousand. "And of these some were in Italy, others in Africa, others in Spain, others in Colchis, others at Alexandria and in the Thebaid, a few on the Persian frontier."

It is to this decay of the army, caused perhaps by jealousy of its immortal leader and by female intrigue, that the same judicious historian, a contemporary and a man of culture, attributes the growing ills of the Roman State. His thoughtful phrase is worth listening to; soon this current of philosophic observation will cease and commonplace chronicling take its place in the seventh and eighth centuries of the Byzantine Empire.

"When the Emperor conquered all Italy and Lybia and waged successfully those mighty wars, and of the Princes who reigned at Constantinople was the first to show himself an absolute sovereign in fact as well as in name—after these things had been acquired by him in his youth and vigor, and when he entered on the last stages of life, he seemed to be weary of labors, and preferred to create discord among his foes or to mollify them with gifts, and so keep off their hostilities, instead of trusting his own forces and shrinking from no danger. He consequently allowed the troops to decline, because he expected that he would not require their services. And those who were second in authority to himself, on whom it was incumbent to collect the taxes and supply the army with necessary provisions, were affected with the same indifference and either openly kept back the rations altogether or paid them long after they were due; and when the debt was paid at last, persons skilled in the rascally science of arithmetic demanded back from the soldiers what had been given them. It was their privilege to bring various charges against the soldiers and deprive them of their food. Thus the army was neglected and the soldiers, pressed by hunger, left their profession to embrace other modes of life."

IV.

The very religious mind of Justinian could not but be much concerned with the social conditions and problems of his time. His legislation bears the impress of this preoccupation—it is highly moral throughout and constantly seeks a concord on ethical and religious principles. Thus, to go through his code haphazard we find him concerned about the building of churches and their good order and tranquillity. He is said to have built twenty-five in Constantinople alone and to have chosen for them the most favorable

sites in public squares, by the sea, in groves, on eminences where often great engineering skill was demanded. The rarest woods and the costliest marbles were employed, and multitudes of laborers given the means of life. They were usually paid every evening with fresh-coined money as a tribute to religion. He built and endowed many nunneries, hospitals and monasteries, notably in the Holy Land, where he also provided wells and stations for pilgrims. Bridges, aqueducts, baths, theatres went up constantly; for building he was a second Hadrian. And all this had a social side—the employment of vast numbers of men, the encouragement of the fine arts, great and little. He is concerned about institutions of charity of every kind, and in their interest makes his own the old and favorable laws of his predecessors. In his day every sorrow was relieved in Constantinople. The aged, the crippled, the blind, the helpless, the orphans, the poor had each their own peculiar shelter, managed by thousands of good men and women who devoted themselves gratuitously to these tasks.²⁰ The slave and the debtor had their rights of asylum acknowledged in the churches and regulated according to the demands of proper police order. The right of freeing the slaves was recognized especially in bishops and priests, and the latter were given the power to control the “defenders of the city”—a kind of popular tribunes, whose duty it was to supervise the proper administration of justice. He undertook to abolish gambling, claiming, curiously enough, that he had the same right to do that as to carry on war and regulate religion. Blasphemy and perjury and the greater social crimes and sins were visited with specially heavy sanctions, though we may doubt if they often passed beyond the written threat.

He legislated humanely for the rescue of abandoned children and for the redemption of those numerous captives whom the barbarians daily swept away from the soil of the Empire. No female could longer be compelled to appear in a theatrical performance, even if she were a slave, even if she had signed a contract to do so, being a free woman. The bishop of each city was authorized to carry out this law. An actress might henceforth marry any member of society, even a Senator. He was personally interested in the thousands of poor girls who came yearly to the Royal City and were often the prey of designing persons who had traveled through the provinces “enticing young girls by promising them shoes and clothes.”

In the last century it was a custom to offset such creditable details

²⁰Bulteau, “*Essai de l'histoire monastique de l'Orient*,” Paris, 1680. The late work of the Abbé Morin, “*Les Moines de Constantinople*,” Paris, 1897, and the study of Dom Besse, very rich in details, “*Les Moines d'Orient antérieurs au Concile de Chalcédoine*,” Paris, 1900, permit the student to obtain a complete conspectus of the monastic history of the Orient.

by reference to the terrible pages of the *Anecdota* or "Secret History" of Procopius. And Gibbon has not failed to expend on them some of his most salacious rhetoric and to violate, for their sake, his usual stern principles of doubt and cynicism.²¹ Perhaps I cannot do better than cite the very recent judgment of a special student of Byzantine history:

"The delicacy or affectation of the present age would refuse to admit the authority and example of Gibbon as a sufficient reason for rehearsing the licentious vagaries attributed to Theodora in the indecent pages of an audacious and libelous pamphlet. If the words and acts which the writer attributes to Theodora were drawn, as probably is the case, from real life, from the green rooms of Antioch or the bagnios of Byzantium, it can only be remarked that the morals of those cities in the sixth century did not differ very much from the morals of Paris, Vienna, Naples or London at the present day."²²

Still milder and more favorable is the judgment of Krause as to the morality of the city of Constantinople, even at a later date, when the first fervor of Christianity had cooled and the city had suffered from the immoral contact of Islam and had become almost the sink of the Orient. From its foundation in 330 to its fall in 1453 Constantinople was always a Christian city, sometimes fiercely and violently

²¹In a few vigorous phrases Edward Freeman has laid bare a structural weakness of Gibbon: "With all his (Gibbon's) wonderful power of grouping and condensation, which is nowhere more strongly shown than in his Byzantine chapters, with all his vivid description and his still more effective art of insinuation, his is certainly not the style of writing to excite respect for the persons or period of which he is treating or to draw many to a more minute study of them. His matchless faculty of sarcasm and depreciation is too constantly kept at work; he is too fond of anecdotes showing the weak or ludicrous side of any age or person; he is incapable of enthusiastic admiration for any thing or person. Almost any history treated in this manner would leave the contemptible side uppermost in the reader's imagination; we cannot conceive Gibbon tracing the course of the Roman Republic with the affection of Arnold, or defending either democracy or oligarchy with the ardent championship of Grote or Mitford." "Historical Essays," 3d series (2d ed.), 1892, pp. 238-239. This recalls what Morison said of Gibbon—that "his cheek rarely flushes in enthusiasm for a good cause." Coleridge's well-known judgment in his "Table Talk" may be worthy of mention, viz., "that he did not remember a single philosophical attempt made throughout the work to fathom the ultimate causes of the decline and fall of the Empire." In an otherwise sympathetic study Augustine Birrell has recorded an equally severe judgment on the historical method and principles of Gibbon: "The tone he thought fit to adopt towards Christianity was, quite apart from all particular considerations, a mistaken one. No man is big enough to speak slightly of the construction his fellow-men have put upon the Infinite. And conduct which in a philosopher is ill-judged is in an historian ridiculous. . . . Gibbon's love of the unseemly may also be deprecated. His is not the boisterous impropriety which may sometimes be observed staggering across the pages of Mr. Carlyle, but the more offensive variety which is heard sniggering in the notes." "Rea Judicatae," New York, 1897, pp. 79-80.

²²Bury, *op. cit.*, II., p. 61. On Procopius in general; cf. Dahn, "Prokopios von Cæsarea," Berlin, 1865; Gutschmid, "Die byzantinischen Historiker" in the "Grenzboten," 1863, I., 344; Ranke, "Weltgeschichte," IV., 2 (1883), 235-312; Bury, "History of Later Roman Empire," (1889), I., 355-364. Ranke is of opinion that the Secret History contains genuine material from the hand of Procopius, as, for instance, the adultery of Antonina, wife of Belisarius. But such materials have been interwoven and overlaid with other assertions not due originally to Procopius, but to jealous and disappointed persons, especially those affected by the stern conduct of Justinian in the Niké sedition (532).

so, nevertheless an essentially Christian foundation. The social life, therefore, of the city, and the Empire that it gave the tone to, could not but be of a higher grade than the pagan life had to show, whether we look at the condition of woman, the poor, the slave and the child, those four usual factors that condition the moral life of all ancient society. All the betterments of Christianity were here available for the slave, and they were many and great. Numberless convents opened their doors to women and proclaimed in them the dignity and independence of human nature in the only way possible in antiquity. The diaconal service of the numberless churches was largely in their hands; it was they who cared for the orphan and the poor and the aged. In the schools they conducted the maidens of the city were taught to read the great classics of the Greek fatherland in a way that did not force them to blush for the first principles of decency. The letters of a Basil and a Chrysostom, the poems of a Gregory of Nazianzum, were written in a language scarcely less pure and elegant than the best masterpieces of Attica.²⁵

The frequent sermons of renowned orators in the churches and the daily conversation of men and women in the best rank and station, particular in language and manner as the Greeks always were, offered a superior culture. Though they had lost their rude liberties, they had not lost their fine ear for verbal music, their keen and disputatious minds. The society of Constantinople was at all times famed for the admirably bred women it could show. Pulcheria, Athenais, Eudoxia, were women of the most varied gifts, and they actually governed the governors of the world by the use of these gifts. The letters of St. John Chrysostom to the Deaconess Olympias, the story of his own mother, of the women of the great Cappadocian family of saints and theologians, reveal a fine and original culture penetrated with religion, but also enthusiastic for all that is holy and permanently fair, worthy and sweet in life. Whence, indeed, could come the strong men who so long held the Royal City above the waves of barbarism and disrupting war and internal disorder but from a truly great race of women? When Constantinople was founded a place was made for the consecrated virgins of the Christian Church. And forever after they held that place of honor so worthily that the tongue of slander has scarcely wagged against them. For over eleven centuries the City stood in the seething

²⁵Withal mediæval society was deeply indebted to the Empire for the materials and traditions with which it began its career. Cunningham, "The Economic Debt to Ancient Rome" in "Western Civilization in Its Economic Aspects," Cambridge University Press, 1900, pp. 5-9; cf. also for the mediæval influence of Constantinople on the West. Döllinger, "Einfluss der griechischen Kultur auf die abend-ländische Welt im Mittelalter," Akad. Vorträge, vol. I., Munich, 1890, pp. 162-186; Burkhardt's "Renaissance," Voigt, "Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums," 2d ed., 1891, and Bikélas, "Les Grecs au Moyen Age," in "La Grèce Byzantine et Moderne," Paris, 1893, pp. 3-88.

waters of secular iniquity, human weakness, Oriental depravity, Moslem immorality and the miscellaneous filth and sinfulness of the corrupt East. Yet she never ceased to fill these religious houses of men and women, especially the latter, and never ceased to behold in them models of the highest spiritual life on earth. We know how to praise the Theophanos, the Marias and the Anna Komnenas of the Greek Middle Ages. But who shall say how many souls of noble women went their way silently along the ancient cloisters by the Bosphorus, wanting indeed in fame, but not wanting in a multitudinous rich service to every need of humanity? The Greek sinned tragically against the duty of Christian unity, but he never lost the original Christian respect for the way of sacrifice and perfection.

V.

The ancient life about the Mediterranean was governed by principles and manners unknown or unappreciated by us.²⁴ The warm sun and the abundant waters of inexpressibly delicate hues, the rich and varied vegetation, the cool and calming winds, render many of these lands the most delightful of the world. Life there has always been an out-of-door life; all the higher forms of social amusement have been affected by the climate and the geography. It was so in Old Rome, it is so in all the lands of Italy, Spain and Southern France to this day. The peasant dances on the public square; the strolling player with his bear or his marionette sets up his tent near by. The harvest festival, the church fête, the relics of old pagan superstitions baptized into harmlessness by innumerable centuries of toleration—all these are lived out in the open air under a cloudless sky, amid balmy breezes laden with the scents of olive and vine, fig and orange, and the most aromatic shrubberies. As these ancient peoples moved up in the forms of government their political life was all out of doors—the speaking, the voting, the mighty contests of eloquence. And when the Greek cities lost to Rome their national isonomy they could still hire some famous sophist or rhetorician, like Dio Chrysostom, to keep up on the “*ágora*” some faint echo or image of their adored old life.²⁵

So it was that when Constantinople was built the life of the city soon centred in its great hippodrome. Since Homer described the

²⁴Lenormant, “*La Grande Grèce*.” Paris, 1881-1884, 3 vols.

²⁵The municipal and domestic life of the Constantinople of Justinian is illustrated somewhat freely in Marrast, “*La Vie Byzantine au VI. Siècle*,” Paris, 1881. For the following centuries cf. Krause, “*Die Byzantiner des Mittelalters*,” Halle, 1869; Schlumberger, “*La Sigillographie Byzantine*,” Paris, 1884. The work of Amedée Thierry on St. John Chrysostom contains admirable sketches of early Byzantine life that are to be supplemented now by the indispensable volume of Aimé Puech, “*St. Jean Chrysostome et les Mœurs de son Siècle*,” Paris, 1890.

races by the much-resounding sea the peoples of the Mediterranean have been inexplicably fond of horse racing, chariot and hurdle racing. If George Moore had lived among them he would have produced a superior Esther Waters. General Lew Wallace has left a classic page or two descriptive of the races at Antioch that will perhaps live while our tongue is spoken. But no one has yet caught the spirit of that great hippodrome by the Golden Horn. It came fresh from Old Rome, with all the prestige of imperial splendor and fondness. In that mighty circus whose ruins yet appall us at Rome an imperial people had ruled, had felt almost as vastly as a god, had raged, thundered, compelled, made to die and to live, had experienced an oceanic fulness of life, a glory of self-adulation such as might befit the highest and whitest Alp or the solemn depths of the Hercynian forest. And so, when at Constantinople the Emperor sat bediademmed in his chosen seat, the autocrator, the pantocrator, the Basileus, the golden King of Kings, it seemed as if his were indeed an "eternal countenance, sacrosanct, holy, inviolable." In him that awful mob saw itself mirrored. Each one, according to his own passion or aspiration, saw the reach and the limit of his own possibilities.

Nothing affected more profoundly the society of Constantinople than the hippodrome or circus. The great multitude of men and women connected with this "peculiar institution" were divided from time immemorial into factions—once red, white, blue, green, from the color of the ribbons attached to the axles of the chariot wheels or to the ears of the horses. These were the symbols borrowed from Old Rome, and in the time of Justinian they had dwindled to two, the blues and the greens. The sympathy of the million inhabitants of the city was divided between them, but with the inconstancy of the mob. In the time of the great Emperor the Greens had become identified with opposition to the Council of Chalcedon, had become the Monophysite factor of the city. They had, moreover, attracted the hatred of the Empress Theodora. The blues were the favorites of the imperial family. The contentions of both were endless and very dangerous. They held open and contemptuous discourse with the Emperor during the races and clamored wildly for justice on their respective enemies. The stormiest scenes on the Pnyx, the fiercest contentions in the Forum, were child's play to the rocking passions of the great mob of blues and greens on some high day of festival. These colors eventually became the symbols of all discontent and rebellion. In 532 their violence reached its height in the sedition of Niké, whereby 30,000 souls perished in the circus and on the streets and a great and splendid part of the city was consumed by flames, including the great church of the Heavenly Wisdom or

Saint Sophia. Perhaps this uprising was the end of the genuine city-life of the ancients, some remnants of whose turbulent freedom had always lived on in Old Rome and then in Constantinople. With the awful butchery of those days the aristocracy of the City was broken under the iron heel of the cold-faced man who dwelt in the Brazen Palace. Neither priest nor noble ever again wielded the power they once held before this event, which may in some sense be said to mark the true beginning of Byzantine imperialism, being itself the last symbolic act of popular freedom. It is significant that the last vestiges of the free political life of Hellas were quenched in the City of Byzas by thousands of ugly and brutal Heruli whom a lucky Slav had attached to himself as so many great Danes or Molossi!

The fiscal policy of Justinian has been criticized as the weakest point of his government. In his time the Roman Empire consisted of sixty-four provinces and some nine hundred and thirty-five cities. It had every advantage of soil, climate and easy transportation. Egypt and Syria should have sufficed to support the imperial majesty with ease and dignity. The former alone contributed yearly to the support of Constantinople 260,000 quarters of wheat. The Emperor's predecessor, Anastasius, dying, left a treasure of some sixty-five million dollars. It is true that terrible plagues and earthquakes devastated the population and reduced its spirit and courage to a minimum. But they were still more disheartened by the excessive and odious taxes. An income tax on the poorest and most toilsome in the cities, known as the "gold of affliction," earned him a universal hatred. The peasants had to provide vast supplies of corn and transport it at their own expense to the imperial granaries, an intolerable burden that was increased by frequent requisitions of an extraordinary kind. The precious metals decreased in quantity partly through the enormous sums paid out annually in shameful and onerous tributes, partly through pillage and the stoppage of production, owing to endless war. Weapons, buildings, fortifications, alms, the movement of great armies and great stores of provisions consumed the enormous taxes. Heavy internal duties were laid, not only on arms, but on many objects of industry and manufacture, thus rendering any profitable export impossible. The manufactures of purple and silk were State monopolies. The value of copper money was arbitrarily raised one-seventh. The revenue was farmed out in many cases, and the venality of the collectors was incredible. Honors and dignities were put up for sale. The office of the magistrate became a trade, out of which the purchaser was justified in reimbursing himself for the cost. The rich were compelled to make their wills in the imperial favor if they wished to save anything for

their families; the property of Jews and heretics was mercilessly confiscated. With one voice the people execrated a certain John of Cappadocia, the imperial banker and Minister of Finance. For a while the Emperor bowed to the storm of indignation, but he could not do without the clear head and hard heart and stern principles of this man, and so recalled him to office. His example of avarice and cruelty was, of course, imitated all along the line of imperial officers and agents. On the other hand, economies that were unjust or unpopular or insufficient were introduced—the civil list of pensions was cut down, the city was no longer lit up at night, the public carriage of the mails was abandoned, the salaries of physicians reduced or extinguished, the quinquennial donative to the soldiers withdrawn. Though the unfortunate subjects of Justinian suffered untold woes in Greece and Thrace and Syria from invasions and the constant movement of large bodies of soldiery, their taxes were never remitted, hence a multitude of abandoned farms and estates. In a word, Justinian “lived with the reputation of hidden treasures and bequeathed to posterity the payment of his debts.” His reign is responsible for the economic exhaustion of the Roman Orient that was prolonged long enough to permit of the triumph of Islam in the next century—one of the most solemn proofs of the intimate connection of social conditions with religious change and revolution.

Justinian had one passion, the imperial passion par excellence, the passion of architecture.²⁶ He delighted in great works of engineering, in prodigies of mechanical invention. We have seen that he built many churches, and rich ones, in the Royal City. He eclipsed them all by his building of Saint Sophia, little thinking that he was raising it for the wretched worship of the successors of an Arab camel driver. For him Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletum raised in the air this new thing in architecture, bold, light, rich, vast, solemn and open. Ten thousand men worked six years at it. They were paid every day at sunset with new-minted pieces

²⁶The art and architecture of ancient Constantinople have never ceased to fascinate a multitude of writers since Ducange. Indeed, the series begins much earlier. Procopius added to his fame as a writer, if not to his character for honesty, by his “*De Edificiis*” (Bonn ed., 1838). His contemporary, the Guardsman Paul (Silentiarius), described in minute detail the glories of Sancta Sophia, and a mass of curious information that drifted down the centuries lies stored up in the book of the antiquarian Codinus, “*De Edificiis*” (Migne PG., vols. 157 and 158). The monumental works of Salzenberg and Labarte have found worthy followers and critics in Pulgher, Paspatis, Unger, Bayet, Ferguson, Müntz, Springer, Kondakoff and Kraus. Cf. Choisy, “*L’Art de bâtir chez les Byzantins*,” Paris, 1884; Bayet, “*L’Art Byzantin*,” Paris, 1883, and Mrs. J. B. Bury in “*History of Lower Roman Empire*,” II., 40-54. For the very abundant literature of this subject cf. Kraus, “*Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*,” Berlin, 1898-1899. 2 vols. Its profound influence on the symbolism of the Middle Ages may be traced partly through “*The Painter’s Book of Mount Athos*” in Didron’s “*Manuel d’Iconographie Grecque et Chrétienne*,” Paris, 1845. Cf. Edward Freshfield on “*Byzantine Churches*” in “*Archæologia*,” vol. 44, pp. 451-462.

of silver. And when it was done the Emperor, standing amid its virgin and shining splendors, could cry out, "Glory to God! . . . I have vanquished thee, O Solomon." It still stands, after twelve hundred years of service, a stately monument to the grandeur of his mind and the vastness of his ideas. He also built in the city the great Chalké or Brazen Palace, so called from a bronze ceiled hall, and across the strait the gardens of the Heræum on the Asiatic shores of the Propontis. Cities rose everywhere at his command, and no ignoble ones. We have seen what a circle of forts and walls he built about the Empire, what expensive enterprises he carried on in the Holy Land. He built and endowed many monasteries and churches elsewhere in the Empire. And if he collected sternly he knew how to spend with magnificence. The churches of Rome and Ravenna were adorned by his generosity—one may yet read in the *Liber Pontificalis*, drawn up by a Roman sacristan, the list of church plate given by the Emperor to the Church of St. Peter. He convoked and celebrated a General Council, which was always a heavy expense to the Empire, for the transportation and support of the prelates. We do not read that he did much for schools. He is accused of closing those at Athens. But they were pagan schools, and modern critics like Gregorovius and others doubt whether they were closed by any formal edict. They fell away by reason of the general misery and the emptiness and inadequacy of their teaching, unfitted for a world that was destined to know no more the serenity of the old Hellenic contemplation, whose weakness it had exchanged for the saving severity of Christian discipline. It is certain that he opened law schools at Berytus, Constantinople and Rome. He made wise provisions for the teaching and conduct of the young lawyers on whom the civil service of the State was to depend. Justinian was no philosopher; he was a theologian and a grave Christian thinker. Perhaps he felt little interest in the propagation of Greek culture. He was a religious orthodox man, troubled about his soul, and concerned with much prayer and inner searching of his spirit. The sweet figments of old Greek poets, like the pure mild rationalism of Confucius, were no food for the ruler of many millions in a decaying and ruinous state, no concern of an Isapostolos, the earthly and civil Vicegerent of the Crucified. He could read in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, scarcely dead a generation before him, of the follies and the criminal heart of a Julian the Apostate, his predecessor. He saw all around him the hopeless congenital weakness of pagan philosophy to bear the appalling evils of the time. Only the Son of Man could save this last stage of the old Græco-Roman society. To Him, therefore, and the Holy Spirit of Celestial Wisdom be all public honor rendered.

VI.

Had Justinian done nothing but restore to the Empire the members torn from it by the convulsions of a century his name would be forever famous among the great rulers of that ancient State. But he did more—he recast the laws of Rome and made them serviceable for all time—those ancient laws in which, as Sir Henry Maine and Rudolph von Ihering have shown, are deposited the oldest experiences and the most archaic institutions of the great Aryan family to which all Western peoples belong. By this act he passed into a higher order of men than even the autocrats of old or new Rome; he became a benefactor of humanity—one of its solemn pontiffs, peer of Solon and Lycurgus, of Aristotle and Plato, of Ulpian and Papinian—nay, a greater than they, for their laws have either perished from society or survive by the act of Justinian. It is not easy to put in a nutshell a subject of such infinite charm and importance. Gibbon thought it worthy of the most immortal chapter in his book, and pens innumerable have labored at describing this great work as men describe the Pyramids or the Alps, with minds distracted by admiration and the stupor that all true greatness inflicts upon us.

The Laws of Rome! It was a long and varied process by which they grew, the steady exercise of that terrible *Majestas Populi Romani*. *Leges* and *plebiscita*, *senatus-consulta* and *responsa prudentum*, *i. e.*, the laws of the forum, the Senate and the renowned opinions of learned jurists—they had grown century by century until their number was legion and their individual original wisdom was crossed by their successive contradictions and repetitions. For seven hundred and fifty years before Christ had the City been growing. In that time every human interest had come up for consideration. The functions of war and peace, of conquest and division of spoils and administration, of trade and industry, commerce and luxury, production and exchange and distribution—every interest arising from the soil, or from the family, or from human agreements, or from the attempts of social authority to assure peace by justice and equity—all these had been the object of Roman legislation. Originally local and jealous, so local that it looked askance at the men of Veii and Præneste, scarce a day's walk away, it expanded mightily and took in what was good in all the legislations of the past, all the solid deposit of business, common sense and commercial practice as it was floating around in what came to be known as the Law of Nations. The common Roman might see in expansion only a chance for trade and power; the great thinkers of the State conceived the purpose of this expansion of the city to be, as the Younger Pliny put it, "*ut humanitatem homini daret*," *i. e.*, the spread of the light of civilization

and its benefits, by the red right hand and the dripping sword if need be. Could we read the minutes of the meetings of the Roman Senate on the annexation of Northern Africa after the Jugurthan War we should be reminded, I dare say, of a certain late session of our own august body of legislators, so true is it that history repeats itself.

When the Republic lapsed into an Empire, so gently that the first Emperor dared only call himself the foremost citizen, the law-making power was the first to pass away from the people. Henceforth there are no *leges*—the world is governed by the will of the Emperor, and he acts through Constitutions and Rescripts, *i. e.*, general and particular decisions, which are registered in the imperial chancery and become the actual law of the land. Besides, there was a peculiar annual legislation of the prætor, or city magistrate, and another body of law arising from the opinions of licensed lawyers—ratiocinated decisions that originally won the force of law by their reasonableness, and in time were collected in books and held almost as sacred as Lex or Constitution. What all this reached to, after five centuries of imperial government of the world, one may well imagine.

As the will of the Emperor was the real source of law since Cæsar's death, so the first attempt at a reform or a codification of the law must begin with the Imperial Constitutions. Two hundred years and more before Justinian, in Old Rome, this need had been felt, and the Gregorian and Hermogenian Codes had been prepared for official use. But they were soon antiquated and a new one, the famous Theodosian Codex, was issued in 438 by the Emperor Theodosius II. But it was rare, bulky, costly and therefore not always at hand. Moreover, numerous grave Constitutions had been added since 438, precisely a time of transition, when the law-making genius is called on most earnestly to adapt the rule to the facts. Justinian established, February 13, 528, a commission of ten men—*decemviri*—to execute a new code. Tribonian and Theophilus were the principal lawyers, and they were charged to see that only up-to-date constitutions were incorporated, minus all that was obsolete or superfluous or repetition or preamble. They might erase, add or alter words in the older Constitutions they accepted, if it was necessary for their use as future law. He wanted three things, brevity, compactness and clearness, and in less than fourteen months he received them in the document to which he gave the name of Codex Justinianus, and which was published April 7, 529.

The next step was harder—it was a question of collecting and sifting the *responsa prudentum*, or answers given by recognized and licensed lawyers, and which had always enjoyed a high degree of

consideration before the magistrates of Rome. They were the real philosophers of the law, but philosophers after the Roman heart, terse, grave, direct, condensing a paragraph of diffuseness into one strong luminous line that seemed to shed truth and peace along its whole length. These answers had been given for over a thousand years, and were then scattered about in numberless treatises—it is said over 2,000, to speak only of those enjoying actual authority. They had been the bane of the Roman bar for many a day. Since they were all good law, and apparently equal, the practice of law had degenerated into citations—whoever had the most dead men to speak for him was the victor. This was intolerable; it came at last to the famous Law of Citations that fixed the five greatest names, and among them, as senior or chief, the immortal Papinian, that high priest, king and prophet of all lawyers, past, present and to come.

At this huge mass of ancient law, therefore, a new commission was directed, under the authority of Tribonian. From this Golden Dust-heap they were to extract, to *enucleate*, what was good and useful as law, or interpretation, or illustration. Out of all the materials they should erect a fair and holy temple of justice, divided into fifty books and these properly sub-divided and paragraphed and numbered. It meant that the decisions of 1,300 years had to be gone over and according to present utility a choice struck and the balance rejected. Seventeen specialists did it in three years. The work was called the Digest or Pandects. There are in it something less than ten thousand *sententiæ*, or brief opinions of ancient lawyers, harmonized, castigated, clarified—at least Justinian and his lawyers thought so. Could Cujas or Donelli have been at their side, what reproachful looks they would have cast! For the Middle Ages hunted out endless contradictions in the huge mass of these “opinions” that only external authority had united. Thereby the ancestors of our present lawyers lived fair and lovely lives with rich benefices and fine gowns of silk or brocade, and the noblest palaces in the town, and ample esteem from Church and State. How they must have smiled when they heard Boccaccio or Pietro Dante commenting on the poet’s famous line,

“D’entro alle leggi trassi il troppo e il vano.”

It is calculated that by the edition of the Digest a law library of 106 books was reduced to $5\frac{1}{3}$, a comparison that only faintly reflects the relief that its publication gave. Finally the Emperor caused the preparation in four books of a manual of the principles of Roman Law, which he called the “Institutions.” It became a part of the codified law, being largely a reproduction and adaptation of a similar

work of the second century that was owing to the great jurist Gaius.²⁷

This work of Justinian has met with some reproaches from our modern critics; perhaps they are deserved. It has been accused of too much theorizing, too much ratiocination, too much blending of the school-master with the legislator to the detriment of the latter. But what man of heart will blame the Emperor for permitting the pagan Tribonian to preserve the color and tone of second and third century Stoicism, for the occasional brief reflections on the origin and nature of human liberty and human dignity? They are delicious oases in a desert of rigid rules and sententious decisions. In this new Roman Law it is the spirit and the content of the Law of Nations that predominate. The old, hard, selfish Romanism is eliminated. From the Golden Horn the Genius of Order lifts up an illuminating torch to shine afar over the Euxine of the Barbarians and the Hellespont of the Greeks—nay, across the Mediterranean and Ægean, even beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and to follow forevermore with its sun-like radiance every path of human endeavor, every channel of human contention, every relation of man to man and of practical government to its subjects.

This Roman Law, after all, was the salt and the light of the Middle Ages. For love of it, even before Justinian, the Ataulfs and the Wallias, standing at the parting of the ways, had renounced becoming a Gothia and were willing to be incorporated in a Romania. They adopted it at once, begging the Catholic bishops of their new kingdoms to accommodate it to their present needs, their racial genius and their immemorial customs. So arose the invaluable *Leges Barbarorum* of Frank and Burgundian and Visigoth and Vandal. Only, the Catholic Church would have no separatist barbarian law, even of that kind. All her ecclesiastics lived by the genuine and common Roman Law, the Law of Justinian: *Ecclesia vivit lege Romana*. Indeed, she was its second savior, and thereby the savior of good government, for in the West it gradually went over very largely into her Canon Law. It was the basis and glory of her oldest university, Bologna, and was the usual path to honor and fame and power. There are those who regret its excessive vitality, since it bears along with it the stamp of its origin, the absolute will of one ruler, which makes it at all times the favorite code of centralized power. The Code Napoléon is built on it, as are most of the great modern codes of Europe. Even Mohammedan law as it arose, in Egypt and Syria especially, accepted and applied the existing law

²⁷The vicissitudes of the law of Justinian in the Latin Middle Ages have been described fully in the classic work of Savigny, and by a host of later writers. For its history in the Orient, cf. Mortreuil, "Histoire du droit Byzantin." Paris, 1843-46. 3 vols.

of Justinian that had been working more than a century in these unhappy lands when, for their folly and stupidity, the night of Islam settled down on them.

It is the Christian, however, who rejoices most at this act of Justinian. Those Roman laws that Tertullian denounced were now baptized.²⁸ A spirit of humanity henceforth breathed from them. The rights of the Moral Code were incorporated into the legal code; religion was not separate from conduct. The new law showed itself most practical in this that it recognized Christianity as triumphant, as the popular religion, and in many ways made a large place for it, recognized its teachers and chiefs as the principal supporters of the State and of public order. The political life of the Middle Ages is all in the Law of Justinian, especially in the Code of his Constitutions, and for this alone it is the most remarkable of books after the Inspired Writings and the Ancient Councils.

It is not wonderful that Dante, at once the greatest of architectonic poets and last prophet of the Empire, crying out over its grave, should speak more than once of Justinian and his laws. In the famous lines of the *Purgatorio* (VI., 89) his whole soul flames out in irrepressible anger.

"Ah! servile Italy, grief's hostelry!
A ship without a pilot in great tempest!
No lady thou of provinces, but brothel!

What boots it that for thee Justinian
The bridle mend, if empty be the saddle?

In the superb sixth Canto of the *Paradiso* he personifies in Justinian the imperial authority that to him is the basis of the State,

"Cæsar I was and am Justinian."

Into the mouth of this shadowy shepherd of men he puts that glorious romantic account of the growth of the Roman name and power:

"What it achieved from Var unto the Rhine,
Isère beheld and Saône, beheld the Seine
And every valley whence the Rhône is filled;
What it achieved when it had left Ravenna,
And leaped the Rubicon, was such a flight
That neither tongue nor pen could follow it."

The true career of Justinian appears to the mediæval poet of Italy and Catholicism as that of a "Living Justice" inspired by God, as the career of a man who upheld the "Standard Sacrosanct" of order and equity, and thereby

"placed the world in so great peace
That unto Janus was his temple closed."

²⁸Postremo legum obstruitur auctoritas adversus eam (sc. veritatem) . . . Si lex tua erravit, puto, ab homine concepta est; neque enim de cælo ruit. Tertullian "*Apologeticum*," c. iv., 20. The entire opusculum is the protest of a great Roman lawyer against the inhuman and anomalous iniquities of the Roman law as applied to the Christians.

Elsewhere (Canzone XVIII., v. 37) he gives voice to the deepest sentiment of the Middle Ages, when he hails in Italy the serene and glorious custodian of law and order, the true heiress of the genius and calling of the Imperium that are indelibly stamped on the Pandects and the Code :

O patria, degna di trionfal fama,
De' magnanimi madre,
Segui le luci di Giustiniano,
E le foci tue malgiuste leggi
Con discezion correggi,
Sicch  le laudi 'l mondo e' l divin regno.

VIII.

In the preceding pages little has been said of Justinian from an ecclesiastical point of view, partly because it is the civil or profane side of his life that here attracts us, partly because of the vast and absorbing interest of the questions and problems that are exhibited when we lift the innermost veil of ecclesiastical history. It was the fate of Justinian to enter upon the last scene of a passionate conflict whose unity had not been broken for a century. The motives of the last protagonists were not always pure or praiseworthy. Local jealousies, festering old sores of a political or economico-social nature, velleities of Coptic and Syrian independence, violent contempt and hatred for the Royal City and its Greek bureaucracy that these paid back with interest prevented the theological questions of the day from being viewed by all in the dispassionate light of simple faith and old tradition. The wrongs of Nestorius were still a rallying cry in Syria, and the injustice wreaked on Dioscorus still roused the fellaheen of Egypt. Obscene spirits, as usual, abounded and fished fortune out of the troubled waters along which moved painfully the bark of Peter. Old sects, schisms and heresies, almost forgotten by the churchmen of the day, still lived on in remote corners of the Orient, to strike hands on occasion with the Nestorian or Monophysite against the common enemy by the Golden Horn.²⁹ Here theology and tax gathering were cultivated with equal ardor until the broken peasant by the Nile or the Orontes knew not what he hated most—the latest fiscal oppression or the noble Tomus of

²⁹For the history of the government of the Greek churches in and since the time of Justinian the work of Cardinal Pitra is invaluable, "*Juris Ecclesiastici Græci Historia et Monumenta*," Rome, 2 vols., 1864-1868; cf. the "*Oriens Christianus*" of Le Qui n, Paris, 1740, 3 vols. (fol), and the precious compilation of Leo Allatius, "*De Ecclesi  Occidentalis et Orientalis perpetua consensione*," Cologne, 1649. Of great value to the historian are the materials collected by Miklosisch and M ller, "*Acta et Diplomata monasteriorum Orientalia*," 1871-1890, 3 vols., and by Cardinal Hergenroether, "*Monumenta Gr ca ad Photium ejusque historiam pertinentia*," Ratisbon, 1869. Usually fair and well-informed is Neale, "*History of the Holy Eastern Church*," London, 1847-1850, 4 vols., of which the first two contain a general introduction, the latter a history of the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

the great Leo that the local Monophysite clergy had so distorted as to make it pass for a blast from Antichrist.

Every Emperor from the second Theodosius had longed to close these gaping wounds, and had even attempted the same with more or less success. In the wild and universal conflict the independence of the ecclesiastical power was pushed aside as secondary to the restoration of outward order and concord. It was an age of great personal and corporate ambitions, on the part of the Oriental clergy in particular. The rapid successions to episcopal sees, brought about by heresy and schism, roused an unholy cupidity in the souls of men otherwise inoffensive to Church or State. Only from Rome do we hear regularly the genuine principles of the relations of the two powers, and only there is any effective resistance preached and carried out against the evil Cæsarpapism that lurked in every imperial heart since Constantine.⁸⁰ Justinian was no exception. First among the Emperors he attains the character of a theologian by his edicts and decrees in the long conflict that arose with the condemnation of Origenism and ended in the painful business of the Three Chapters. Here he recalled the worst day of Arianism, when Constantius at Milan laughed to scorn the canons of the Church and bade the bishops remember that he was their canon law. Justinian had been brought up religiously; the little manual of conduct that the good deacon Agapeetus prepared for him is yet preserved and has always been highly esteemed as the parent of those numerous *Instructiones Principum*, *Monitiones* and the like that we meet with in the Middle Ages. He was profuse, by word and act, in his devotion to the Apostolic See of Peter; he acknowledged the supremacy of its authority that had stood a rude and long test in the Acacian Schism just closed, and the *Liber Pontificalis* relates with compla-

⁸⁰Much has been written in the last three centuries on the relations of Church and State at Constantinople. Cf. Riffel, "Geschichtliche Darstellung der Verhandlungen zwischen Kirche und Staat," Mainz, 1836, vol. I.; Niehues, "Geschichte der Verhandlungen Zwischen Kaiserthum und Papsthum im Mittelalter," Münster, 2 vols., 1877-1890. The monograph of A. Gasquet, "L'Autorité impériale en matière religieuse à Byzance," Paris, 1879, and his "Études Byzantines," ib., 1888, are of superior worth. Admirable in every way is Charles Diehl's "Étude sur l'administration byzantine en Italie," Paris, 1888. Especially ch. vi., pp. 368-417, on the relations of the Roman Church with the Emperor of Constantinople. They may be read most usefully in connection with the notes of the Abbé Duchesne to his edition of the "Liber Pontificalis." Cf. Ternovsky, "Die griechische Kirche und die Periode der allgemeinen Kirchenversammlungen," Kiew, 1883; Gelzer, "Die politische und kirchliche Stellung von Byzanz," Leipzig, 1879; Krüger, "Monophysitische Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhang mit der Reichspolitik," Jena, 1884. These latter works are colored by the peculiar convictions of their learned authors, as is also Pichler, "Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident," Munich, 1864. The Catholic point of view is masterially expounded in the first volume of the classic work of Cardinal Hergenroether, "Photius," Regensburg, 1867-69, 3 vols. It also contains the best resumé of Byzantine Church history before Photius. Of this work Krumbacher, the historian of Byzantine literature, says (p. 232): "Hauptschrift über Photius ist und bleibt wohl noch langer Zeit das durch Gelehrsamkeit und Objectivität ausgezeichnete Werk des Kardinals J. Hergenroether." In Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale," Paris, 1888, there is a popular description from a Catholic viewpoint of the politico-ecclesiastical rôle of the city and clergy of Constantinople from its foundation.

cency his gifts to the Roman churches. He received Pope Agapetus with all honor, but his treatment of the unhappy Vigilius has drawn down on him the merited reprobation of all.⁸¹ Perhaps he felt less esteem for the person of the latter, whom he had known intimately as a companion of Agapetus; perhaps, too, his own final lapse into the heresy of an extreme Monophysite sect was a just sanction for the violence done to a sinning but repentant successor of Peter. He confirmed the ambition of the patriarchs of Constantinople and secured finally for them the second rank, at least in honor. Under him the third canon of the Council of Constantinople (381), and the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon (451), that Rome had energetically rejected, were tacitly accepted. In the long struggle the honor and the liberties of Alexandria and Antioch had gone down in spite of the papal efforts to save them. The consequences of this were seen within a century in the rapid unhindered spread of Islam over Egypt and Syria and its assimilation of Persia, whereby the fall of Constantinople was made certain. He ruled the churches at pleasure, and with a rod of iron, divided ecclesiastical provinces, deposed and exiled the highest patriarchs, and not only humiliated Saint Peter in the person of Vigilius, but compelled his successors to ask for imperial confirmation and to send large sums of money to secure it. It was well for the churches that no second Justinian followed him. But his despotic temper and his precedents were not soon forgotten. Perhaps it may be urged for him that he met habitually only a weak and sycophantic curial clergy, and that the ancient bonds of Empire were all but dissolved in the Orient. He is still remembered in the Greek Church for his hymns, one of which is still in frequent use.⁸² Indeed, he is, perhaps, the oldest hymnographer of the Greeks. But when all has been said, it remains true that his was the timely, welcome, and long reign of an orthodox Emperor, that he broke the impact of Monophysitism, that he was generous beyond measure to the churches, and to the poor extremely charitable. The Christian episcopate of the East looked on him as a father and a providence, and in the storms of the century he was never too far below his high calling. The Western churches loved

⁸¹Cf. "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne) s. v. Vigilius; Duchesne, "Revue des Questions Historiques," April, 1895. Thomas Hodgkin, "Italy and Her Invaders," Oxford, 1896 (2d ed.), vol. IV., c. xxiii. "The Sorrows of Vigilius," pp. 571-594.

⁸²"Only-begotten Son and Word of God, Immortal, Who didst vouchsafe for our salvation to take flesh of the Holy Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary, and didst without mutation become man and wast crucified, Christ our God, and by death didst overcome death, being One of the Holy Trinity and glorified together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, save us." Julian, "Dictionary of Hymnology," London, 1892, p. 460. Cf. Edmond Bouvy, "Les Origines de la Poésie Chrétienne," in "Lettres Chrésiennes," vol. IV., 1882, and for the hymn, Christ and Parankas, "Anthologia Græca Carminum Christianorum," Leipzig, 1871, p. 52. Stevenson, "Du rythme dans l'hymnographie grecque." Correspondant, Oct., 1876, and the epoch-making essay of Cardinal Pitra, "Hymnographie de l'Eglise Grecque," Rome, 1867.

to remember him as he is depicted in mosaic in San Vitale at Ravenna, clad in imperial purple, surrounded by his officers of state and offering gifts to the bishop of that see.⁸⁸

To the bishops of the West, standing amid the ruins of Roman civilization, his person and reign appeared like those of another Constantine. He was, indeed, a beacon light, set fair and firm where the old world of Greece and Rome came to an end, and along its last stretches the stormy ocean of mediæval life already beat threateningly.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

ANGLO-SAXON MISSIONARY METHODS.

THE results and methods of Catholic and Protestant missions to heathen races in the modern world are so essentially different that the use of "missionary" as a common name for the agencies of both is open to grave misconception. The great majority of the latter are carried on by English-speaking nations, and there is a strong similarity between the sentiment which inspired their origin and which is professedly more national than religious. In the usage of to-day "Anglo-Saxon" is much used as a designation, however defective, for the characteristics of the populations which look on English traditions in politics, social life and religion as specially their own inheritance. Many claim the designation in this country rather than that of American, and by such a class the Hawaiian mission has been conducted. For this reason only we have given the above title to our brief history.

The history of missions begins with Christianity itself. The charge "Go and teach all nations" was the authority for the first mission, the Apostles the first missionaries. Ever since missions have formed an important part of the work of the Church in the world. To convey the religion taught by Christ to those outside

⁸⁸On the affection of the Christian episcopate for the empire, cf. Boissier, "*La Fin du Paganisme*," Paris, 1891, vol. II., p. 491. The letters of Gregory the Great (590-604) are a proof of this idealistic devotion that disappeared at Rome only during the Iconoclastic follies. Even as late as Fredegarius and Isidore of Seville the "*imperii felicitas secura*" was for the Catholic clergy of France and Spain the model condition of civil affairs.

the Church is as much a duty of her pastors as the instruction of the Catholic people within. There have been times of greater or less extension of the Church, but there is none at which missionary work was not carried on among some non-Christian population.

The establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire was followed by missions for its spread among foreign nations. St. Patrick in the fifth century, Columba in the sixth, St. Augustine in the seventh and Boniface in the eighth kept up, without break, the work of extension. The next four centuries were marked by successful mission work in Poland, Hungary, Scandinavia and the Slavonian nations. In the thirteenth century Dominicans and Franciscans were teaching Christian doctrine to Mongols and Thibetans and Catholic Bishops were established in remote China. The great inroad of Mahometanism under the Tartar races in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries arrested for a time the progress of Christian missions, but the work was taken up again with renewed vigor when Columbus opened America and Vasco de Gama Asia to intercourse with Christian Europe. The chain of Catholic missionaries has continued in America from Las Casas to Father De Smet, in Asia from Francis Xavier to the martyred Bishops and priests of Tonking, in the islands of Oceanica from Urdaneta to Bishop Battailon, in Africa from Francis of Assisi to Cardinal Massaja.

The hundred and fifty years that preceded the Protestant Reformation was the period of least outward extension in the whole history of Christianity. The Turks and Mongols and Moors girdled Europe with Mahometan foes and cut off nearly all access to the heathen lands beyond. With the discovery of America a new field was opened for Catholic missionary activity which was actively cultivated during the next three centuries.

Las Casas and Pedro de Cordova began the work of converting the American natives before the revolt of Luther. It was continued by a host of successors through both American continents from Canada to Patagonia down to our own days. The Reductions of Paraguay and California, the heroism of Peter of Ghent, Betanzos and Zumarraga in Mexico, the dauntless charity of Jogues and Brebœuf in Canada are only a few chapters in the mission history of America from Las Casas to Father De Smet and Archbishop Seghers. An Indian Catholic population of at least twenty-five millions is to-day the proof that this work was not in vain. In Asia under the rule of pagan monarchs similar results were attained. The converts to Christian belief in Japan numbered nearly a million in the seventeenth century and more than half that number in China. In India, from the capital of the Mogul to Cape Comorin, Catholic congregations were formed everywhere. In Annam to-day, after

fifty years of persecution as unsparing as any in history, nearly a million of Christians are a monument of the success of Catholic missions. The seven millions of Catholics in the Philippines are another.

It is a historical fact that in all this diffusion of Christianity no part was taken by the European nations which had separated from the Church in the Protestant Reformation. Spaniards, Portuguese, Frenchmen and Italians, Belgians and Germans all shared in the work, but the Protestant nations, though claiming to be Christian, took neither part nor interest in the conversion of heathen populations. England and Holland were the most prominent nations in the work of European colonization and conquest during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but their governments and people alike showed no desire to impart their religions to the native races with whom they came in contact. While the English populace was denouncing the "idolatries" of Catholics at home and sending Archbishop Plunkett and the other victims of the Popish Plot to the scaffold in their zeal for Protestantism, the founder of Calcutta, Job Charnock, was offering sacrifice to Siva at the grave of his Hindoo wife, and the Dutch merchants were trampling on the Cross in Nagasaki to prove to Japanese pagans that they were not Christians like the converts of Francis Xavier. High minded men like the Irish Berkeley and the New England Eliott attempted in vain to excite the religious feeling of the English people to the conversion of the American Indians. At the close of the American Revolution there was hardly a single English Protestant of any denomination engaged in the conversion of heathen races in any part of the world.

In the ferment of social projects which marked the era of the French Revolution that of the conversion of heathens to Christianity attracted attention among English Protestants for the first time. It was a time of new ideas and reforms of every kind—poor schools, penology and reading rooms—and money was forthcoming freely for putting such ideas into practice. After considerable discussion a body of three hundred ministers of various denominations organized, in 1795, the London Missionary Society. Its professed object was "to lead heathen populations into gradual acquaintance with the glorious Truths of Revelation." The methods of attaining this desired end were the circulation of the Bible and founding small colonies of clergymen and artisans as "little models of a Christian community" in such localities as would guarantee safety of life, a healthy climate and no inordinate difficulty of languages to the prospective apostles. The expenses were to be met in the first place by subscriptions from the charitably disposed at home and afterwards by the returns that might be expected from developing the resources

of the lands evangelized. The South Sea Islands were selected as the first field of the new missionary experiment on all the above grounds and also in view of the convict settlements in Australia which had been begun by the British Government at Botany Bay. Benevolent individuals subscribed freely to the new and romantic enterprise. A vessel was purchased and thirty or more "missionaries" of various trades, with their families, were furnished with passage and support to the South Seas to begin the new work of converting the heathen there. The missionary vessel, it may be added, secured a cargo of tea for her home trip, thus combining zeal and profit in characteristic English fashion.

The enterprise thus begun proved a financial success. The white men got grants of land and built up comfortable homes in the tropics and the natives accepted them as their superiors instinctively. Numerous other missions on the same plan followed during the next few years. The various Protestant missions, both English and American, now spread over the world and which have become so conspicuous lately in China, Turkey and other lands, are nearly all founded on the methods of the original London Missionary Society. Though their result has been insignificant as far as the spread of Christianity is concerned, the missionary element is an important factor in the commercial and political world to-day. The word "missionary" in modern English ideas conveys an idea so widely different from the meaning attached to it by history and the Catholic world that with the majority it has become a term of scorn. Lord Salisbury's late address to the English missionary representation is a strong illustration of the fact. To confound the work of St. Francis Xavier, of the civilizers of Paraguay and the martyrs of Japan and Corea with so-called missions of the English type is a crime against the well being of humanity itself. It seems to us that the difference can best be shown by the detailed history of a modern Protestant mission. We shall select that of Hawaii, which has been for many years put forward as a successful instance of the Christianization of a heathen people by Protestant mission methods. The missionary organization which undertook has proclaimed the work complete and ended. It has had its history officially drawn up by one of its officers, Dr. Rufus Anderson, who claims full acquaintance with its details. His statements have been supplemented by a history, lately published by the last native Queen of the race, converted Liliuokalani, as well as by numerous other eye witnesses. We shall let all these tell the methods and results of modern Protestant mission work.

The mission to Hawaii was the work of the New England Congregationalist body, which at the time was the State Church of Massa-

chusetts. Conversion of the heathen had formed no part of Puritan religious activity for two hundred years after the settlement at Plymouth Rock. According to Dr. Anderson it was about 1816 that the attention of New England Protestants was first awakened to the duty of communicating revealed truth to the pagan world. The first attempt at discharging the duty was a very modest one. About twenty-five boys and young men from different foreign countries, who had come to Boston in the course of trade, were gathered into a school at Cornwall and there taught English and church attendance. The wisdom of the newly established "Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions" considered that after a few years of this schooling the wanderers would return home and make Christians of their countrymen by their shining example. These artless hopes were rudely disappointed, as might be expected, and the school was closed in a few years. The Board next ventured on a more daring attempt to send out ministers of the Gospel, already trained as such, to the foreign lands. With some distrust in purely religious agencies, it decided to add laymen of different occupations who might be willing to seek fortune abroad and incidentally to furnish the heathen with good example of Christian lives. Three young ministers, all newly married—Messrs. Bingham, Thurston and Whitney—offered their services for the task. A doctor, a printer and a farmer, with five children, made up the "missionary" colony. Passage was secured in a Boston vessel bound for Hawaii and a large stock of goods provided for the support of the mission and profitable dealing with the natives. The party reached Hawaii without accident in 1820.

They found Hawaii perfectly safe as a residence for strangers. A native chief, Kamehameha, had brought the whole group under a single despotic government during the early years of the century. His conquests had been largely effected by the use of European arms and the help of European deserters from the ships which touched at the islands. Some of these had been made Governors of islands, and respect for Europeans had become a principle with the native chiefs.

Under the strong hand of Kamehameha the wars, formerly common among the different tribes, had been stopped, and deeds of violence or robbery among the population were suppressed by summary executions. The evidence of the missionaries and of subsequent visitors attest that deeds of violence were rarer among the people of Hawaii than in most parts of America or Europe. The high chiefs, it is true, held power of life and death over their inferiors as absolutely as the Sultan of Turkey, but they carefully avoided any violence towards Europeans. The young King readily granted the land asked for a settlement by Mr. Bingham and expressed his pleas-

ure at the arrival of the newcomers. He visited the ship which had brought them in his native dress, and even got drunk on board, as the mission chronicler relates.

A circumstance specially favorable to the teachers of a new religion at this time had just occurred. The Hawaiian original belief was tolerably vague. A number of supernatural beings were recognized as deities, one of the most formidable being Pele, the presiding spirit of the great volcano of Hawaii. An elaborate system of superstitions or "Tabus" regulated the life of the people under the supposed sanction of the native gods. Men and women could not eat together, and various articles of food were strictly forbidden to different classes, and even to women of the highest rank. On the death of Kamehameha two of his widows were regarded as the highest persons in the State, though the son of one of them was the nominal King. The royal ladies found the Tabus inconvenient, and advised their abolition. The young King and other chiefs feared disaster if the attempt were made, and some agitation followed among the people. A curious incident settled the difficulty. Two temples had been built, and the King was required to dedicate them according to traditionary usages. He, unfortunately, imbibed too much rum at the ceremony, and not only confused the rites, but broke the great Tabus by eating roast dog with the women and smoking from their pipes. As no manifestation of supernatural wrath followed, the whole native religious system was pronounced a fraud by Queen Kaahumanu and the chiefs of her party. The temples were closed, numbers of idols burned and the old rites forbidden to the people. This had occurred before the landing of the New England missionaries, who found a land absolutely without a religion in consequence. The Queens were ready to adopt some substitute, on the European plan, if they could find one, but the King was anxious to continue free from restraint on his habits by religion of any kind.

The missionaries made no attempt to explain the purpose of their coming for some time. In fact, they had no knowledge of the language, and besides their time was occupied in providing suitable houses for their families in which the furniture and other resources of civilization might be properly displayed to heathen eyes. Three pupils of the Cornwall school had been brought as interpreters, but they proved useless, as the mission chronicler explains, because their education had been confined to teaching them English and had given them "very few ideas." The missionaries, then, had to learn the native language themselves, and they evidently found it a hard task. An easier method of reaching the confidence of the Queen, however, was found. She became deeply interested in the dress of

the missionaries' wives and employed them to make similar articles for her own use. The picture of the trials of modern missionaries given in Mr. Bingham's letters to the Board is graphic and unique.

"Just look into the straw palace of a Hawaiian Queen, in the first or second year of our sojourn among them, and see a missionary's wife waiting an hour to get Her Majesty to turn from her cards to try on a new dress for which she has asked. Hear her curt remarks: 'Too tight; off with it; make it over again,' and see the lady patiently obeying the orders." But the reward was to come. "Within another year Kaahumanu, Keopalu, Kapiolana and other chiefs threw around themselves an air of rising consequence by the increase not only of clothing, but of furniture, noticing and trying to imitate what attracted their attention in the mission families. The mission," adds the historian, "was divinely guided on the right way. The ladies had been well educated in domestic habits. They showed the native women how to make garments for themselves and their children." Millinery as an agent of conversion is certainly a new discovery in the annals of the human race. Mr. Bingham deserves whatever credit it may bring him as a Christian missionary. Kaahumanu, under the influence of her new silk dresses, declared herself willing to take up the "prayer" of her dressmakers instead of the old rites. The offer was hailed as a triumph of grace, but some peculiarities of conduct in the royal proselyte made the missionaries doubtful about receiving her as a real Christian. She had just taken as husband a chief of Kauai, who had at least one other wife. She also was inclined to have natives who incurred her anger killed without ceremony, and finally she even treated the missionaries as her inferiors. The mission historian in another place gives the information that Kaahumanu had a resemblance to the English Elizabeth, and even declares that her disposition was very like that of the head of the mission, Mr. Bingham himself. For all these causes the missionaries deemed it best to defer her reception into the fold for some years.

The science of Christian dressmaking was confined to the female evangelists. Mr. Bingham found another work in the art of printing. It does not appear that he was able to make himself understood by the natives in their own tongue when he began the work of translating parts of the Scripture and hymns into Hawaiian. He made out a simple alphabet of twelve English letters, after an ineffectual attempt to imitate the work of the Cherokee Sequoia, by reducing the Hawaiian tongue to a syllabary. The printer of the mission now came to be as useful as the dressmakers in gaining attention. The new invention caught immediate attention. A chief got a few printed sheets, and in a month and a half had mastered them

so far that he wrote a short note himself to the missionaries. The novelty attracted the simple natives irresistibly. The chiefs not only learned to read, but ordered their people to do the same. As soon as some natives mastered the art they were ordered to go as teachers among the others. Within a few years fifty thousand of all ages were working at the printed sheets furnished them by the mission, and nearly a third of them, it was claimed, could read fairly well. When we are told that a woman of 80 accomplished the task it does not seem as if the new accomplishment involved any special intellectual effort. It came to an end about 1832 nearly as suddenly as it had begun. The reason given is that the teachers had exhausted their knowledge. Dr. Anderson admits that the native teachers could not have a very adequate idea of the nature of religion, but he adds sagely: "What they taught was invaluable."

The spread of reading was exclusively a native occupation. Some missionaries who visited Molokai for the first time found over a thousand scholars, such as they were, in that island. The books, however, were furnished by the missionaries and proved an important source of income. With prudent thrift "the mission deemed it best for the natives to pay for their books in products or in labor." In some places native cloth, in others wood, in all meat, fresh vegetables and labor were required. Even land grants seem to have been known. Boki, a chief whose fondness for native customs caused much grief to the missionaries, gave a valuable estate at Pauhunau to Mr. Bingham. It is now the seat of the Oahu College.

While the printing and millinery departments of the new mission were thus favorably progressing, both in the way of revenue and in gaining royal favor for their practitioners, it does not appear that anything in the way of teaching the doctrines of Christianity was done for four or five years. Several chiefs, like Kaahumanu, were quite willing to call themselves Christians, much in the same way as Kamehameha had raised the British flag years before on the advice of Captain Vancouver. Hardly any, however, knew enough even of the simplest principles to warrant their admission. The Queen mother, Keopulani, was one of the would-be proselytes. She was attacked by fatal illness in 1823, and two missionaries went to see her and decided she had better be baptized. A large number of the chiefs, however, were present, and the missionaries felt that their knowledge of the language would not warrant them in explaining the significance of the rite to the Hawaiian intelligence. Their embarrassment was relieved by the arrival of an English visitor from Tahiti who could speak Hawaiian and did, actually, baptize the Queen. This and the marriage of one of the original interpreters to a native woman seem to have been the only public acts connected

with religion that were offered to the natives during the first three years of the mission.

It was felt that something must be done to give a more positively religious character to the work for the satisfaction of the subscribers at home in America. A favorable opportunity offered in 1824. A native chief revolted in Kauai, and Kaahumanu sent a thousand warriors to put down the insurrection. It was the old custom to begin battles with some religious forms, and as the Tabus were suppressed the Queen Regent adopted a kind of semi-Christian rite. The warriors were ordered to observe a day's fast and to put off battle till after Sunday. The observance of the Sabbath appears to have been a main article of Christian practice in the system of the New England missionaries. The battle was fought with all the old savagery and won by the royalists. Kaahumanu accepted the victory as a proof of the superiority of the white man's "prayer" and renewed her request to Mr. Bingham for enrollment as a Christian. The missionaries apparently concluded it best to accommodate her and to make some attempt at giving the nation the name of Christian. The Regent and several other chiefs were baptized, and in return Bingham became the Queen's Chief Counsellor. A number of the chiefs even began to hold prayer meetings among their followers without further instruction from the missionary teachers. Kaahumanu held a great council, in which she proclaimed her determination to govern hereafter on the precepts of the Gospel. The missionaries on their part declared they would not interfere in politics, but that as teachers "they would declare the whole Word of God, whatever its bearings might be on former customs or existing proceedings of government or people." With a despotic sovereign pledged to obey the Gospel teachings, and the missionaries the recognized exponents of the Gospel, it is not easy to see the value of the promise.

The laws, in fact, began immediately to take on a peculiar character. Strict observance of the Sabbath was ordered for all the natives and penalties decreed against the liquor traffic, the use of tobacco and the observance of many of the native customs which did not meet the approval of Mr. Bingham. In some parts of the islands, we are told, the natives ascertained the date of the Sabbath, and on that day put on their best clothes and went to sleep in their houses. The native dances, and especially their custom of chanting over the dead, were strictly prohibited, though on what principle it is not easy to discover. Uncouth manners must be changed was the missionary maxim strictly enforced. It is curious that in 1826, when hardly any natives had as yet received Christian instruction, a decree was issued that all marriages should be performed by the mission-

aries alone. The historian does not mention what offerings were required of the contracting parties on these occasions.

Some troubles with English and American visitors to Honolulu arose from the new regulations. The United States sloop *Dolphin* visited the islands in 1825, and her commander insisted that a regulation forbidding women to go on board ships should be abrogated. It was an unsavory business and resulted in the trumping up of claims of American citizens against the native chiefs to the amount of half a million dollars. Another American vessel visited Honolulu the next year to enforce this claim, and a tax of sandalwood had to be levied on the population to meet the extortion. With this display of the power of foreign nations the dependence of the Queen on Bingham was increased enormously. She determined that the common people, who had hitherto been left to themselves by the missionaries, should become Christians. In company with several missionaries, for the force of the latter had been greatly enlarged by reinforcements from New England, she made a tour through Oahu and preached in her own fashion to the people. The result is best given in the words of Dr. Anderson:

"The people were accustomed to obey the chiefs without hesitation. The chiefs gave orders to build churches and school houses, to learn to read—they did so; to listen to sermons of the missionaries, to forsake sin and turn to the Lord—they put on, without hesitation, the form of religion at least." It is not surprising that a couple of years later, when the young King took authority and withdrew the law of compulsory attendance at church and schools, both were at once deserted. The mission historian consoles himself by the reflection that the "mass of the population must have had glimpses, at least, and many distinct apprehensions of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. Such was the conversion of the Hawaiians when an American President, Quincy Adams, sent the missionaries congratulations on the progress in the islands of letters and true religion, the religion of the Christian Bible. The action of Kaahumanu and her missionary guides towards the Catholics in Hawaii is a strange comment both on the tolerance and the truthfulness of the latter and of the spirit which the new religion inspired in its converts. Two priests, Fathers Bachelot and Short, landed in Hawaii in 1827, as the New England missionaries had seven years before, to instruct and convert the natives to Christianity. The pagan chief who then ruled had encouraged the spread of instruction and given lands to the preachers of religion. The recently baptized Kaahumanu made the profession of Catholicity a crime and branded the Catholic religion as idolatry. Nor was this a passing outburst of savage temper. A bitter persecution of the natives who joined

the Catholic Church was kept up for ten years until ended by the interference of France in behalf of religious toleration. The allusions to this discreditable portion of the mission history made by Dr. Anderson are both disingenuous and cowardly. He admits the banishment of the priests and a persecution of their converts, but he claims that it was the act of the native Queen alone and alleges that her own reasoning made her regard Catholicity as identical with the old heathen rites of Hawaii. His further statement that when she was disabused of this idea the persecution ceased is a direct falsehood. The persecution continued seven years after the death of Kaahumanu, while Bingham's influence was still supreme. Dr. Anderson admits that toleration was only granted in 1839, and while cautiously disclaiming any endorsement of persecution he describes the demand for toleration made by the French naval officer as an "outrage on the natives." He appears perfectly ready to proscribe Catholicity, if it could be done in secret, but shrinks from acknowledging the fact.

A full report of the persecution was drawn up at the time by Father Short and the Brothers who remained in Honolulu after his first expulsion. It is substantiated by decrees issued in the name of the Hawaiian King and reports from Honolulu newspapers. From these sources we give the story of the new Puritan persecution in Hawaii.

The Catholic missionaries had entered Hawaii as other Europeans did. The Queen, under Bingham's advice, endeavored to drive them away by threats, but no heed was paid to them. A number of natives began to attend the Catholic services and ask instruction. Several were baptized and a Catholic congregation was growing up in Hawaii when the Queen issued a decree forbidding attendance at Catholic worship. Though the natives were accustomed to obey their chiefs in professing any religion, as Dr. Anderson declares, the Catholic converts proved an exception. They continued to practice their religion in spite of the royal decree, and in consequence a number were arrested in 1830 and imprisoned for some months. They were required to abandon the Pope's religion and join "Binames prayer," and on their refusal were sentenced to hard labor on the fortifications.

The young King about this time showed an inclination to assert his own authority and the persecution ceased a while. Kaahumanu soon recovered her ascendancy. The next year nine natives were condemned to hard labor and confiscation of property for profession of the Catholic Faith. One, Esther Uheté, was a high chief, but she was treated with the same brutality as the others. They were kept at their task till the death of Kaahumanu, in 1832. In the meantime

Fathers Bachelot and Short were arrested, put forcibly on a vessel owned by the native government and sent to California.

Kaahumanu died in 1832, and the young King, Kamehameha III., showed some inclination to throw off the control already assumed in government by the missionaries. The Catholic prisoners were released, on the request of the English Consul, and attendance at Protestant service was no longer enforced. In consequence the churches and schools were deserted by the natives and the mission seemed in danger of a complete collapse. Kinau, the daughter of the first Kamehameha, was, however, as devoted to Bingham's influence as her step-mother, and she had a strong party among the chiefs. The young King soon resigned himself to her guidance, and the persecution of Catholics began again. In 1835 about twelve men and women were arrested as adherents of the Pope, and by a refinement of brutality were set to cleaning the privies of the fort at Honolulu with their hands. The English and American Consuls remonstrated against these brutalities, but their demand was opposed by Mr. Bingham in person. He declared that all the natives should have only one thought in religion, and the chiefs accepted this theory as part of the new Gospel.

Though sending home glowing accounts of the conversion of Hawaii, the missionaries about this time were seriously alarmed as to the future of their mission. The readiness with which the natives had abandoned all practices of the new religion when Kamehameha III. relaxed the decrees of his step-mother showed how little hold the new doctrines had. Less than two thousand converts had been enrolled as church members during 19 years. The fad for reading schools had completely ended and the tangible evidences of Hawaiian Christianity that could be reported were mainly the European dresses and furniture adopted by the chiefs. Mr. Bingham, we are told, urged the industrial development of the country on the New England Missionary Board as the most promising field for evangelical labor. His suggestion was not adopted for prudential motives. A revival on the well-known New England system was next tried. This is known in missionary annals as the great awakening of 1837. The natives of all classes were hunted up by the mission servants and gathered for prayer meetings, at which their feelings were wrought up to hysterical outbursts of shrieking and praying. The missionaries profited by the excitement to enlarge their nominal following. The common people had not, as a rule, been admitted to baptism on the ground of their want of adequate instruction. The revival meetings were assumed to have remedied this defect and the attendants were baptized into the Church indiscriminately. Within three years over twenty thousand were thus

enrolled. One missionary, Mr. Coan, baptized over seven thousand on his own account. The mission historian records that a year later he found the new converts more ignorant and less religious than before the great awakening. Similar experiences are not confined to the Hawaiians.

The revival had been the signal for greater persecution of the Catholic natives. In 1838 six were sentenced for life to hard labor, and three women among them were further condemned to work in the chain gang with public prostitutes. This dirty infamy speaks volumes of the moral tone of the Protestant missionaries then in Hawaii. Fresh cruelties were also tried. Catholic women were triced up by the wrists for many hours to compel them to adopt the "prayer of Bingham," and that worthy himself witnessed the torture in his carriage. The persecution continued until a French frigate, *L'Artemise*, arrived in Honolulu and its captain required the release of the Catholic prisoners and full freedom for the exercise of religion in the future. The King accepted the terms and the latest persecution was thus ended. Dr. Anderson describes this demand for toleration as an outrage on native rights!

With the death of Kinau, in 1839, the influence so long enjoyed by Mr. Bingham with the government was shaken. The King showed less regard for his religious teachings than his sister and stepmother had done and developed an attachment for old customs, which promised ill for his continued submission to the new ways of life. The missionaries and their lay assistants were nearly a hundred, and as the revival had failed to bring any permanent accession of native converts, mission energy was turned to politics.

The old tribe organization, as it was throughout all the Polynesian islands in the days of Cook, was practically the only government known in Hawaii under Kaahumanu and Kinau. Every tribe had a hereditary chief, whose power over everything in his domain was absolute and unquestioned. In old days a kind of supernatural character was attached to the persons of the great chiefs, and disobedience to them was held as a sacrilege. In Hawaii when Kamehameha I. made all the islands obey his authority, he merely became the greatest among many other great chiefs who still continued to rule their own tribes as before. Each chief divided the land, the fishing grounds and the woods among his people in separate plots for their support and kept others for his own use which were worked for his benefit by the common labor. The sale of land was unknown, the territory of each tribe was its common property and the chief only regulated its use. Like the old Highland chiefs, each kept a number of personal retainers, who lived in grass huts around the chief's dwelling and were supported from his lands. The only

change introduced by Kamehameha was the appointment of special governors over the different islands and the building of a fort and some vessels as a royal military force. The revenues of both King and chiefs were drawn mainly from their lands. The King levied small dues on foreign vessels and licenses for some occupations, especially distilling and liquor selling. The great chiefs formed a council for the King and practically controlled his action. Decrees from this body or the King alone were occasionally issued as laws, but foreigners paid little attention to them, nor was there any special force to put them into execution except among the natives.

The missionaries had been quite content with this system of government so long as supreme authority remained in the hands of the two Queens, who implicitly followed their own instructions. With the death of Kinau in 1839 and the stop put to persecutions of Catholics, a change came over the missionary minds. They decided that mission interests called for a government of more civilized form, as they had been held to call for the substitution of European dress for the native bark clothes and feather mantles. The native ideas of land tenure appeared particularly barbarous to their ideas, and they urged the necessity of reform in this point on the chiefs with more earnestness than religious doctrines. At the departure of the first mission colony from New England a sermon had been preached, the text of which, according to Dr. Anderson, was the significant one, "There yet remained very much land to be possessed." As the Hawaiian land could not well be possessed by the missionaries while it remained common tribal possession, Mr. Bingham and his colleagues now decided it their plain duty to get the tribal system abolished. There were, however, only about eighty white men in the colony, so persuasion, not force, was adopted to accomplish the desired end. The missionaries advised the King to organize his country on European political models, holding out the promise that he would then be looked on as an equal with Kings of England or France, whose ships had recently threatened to take summary possession of the country. As the native intelligence knew nothing of the forms of European governments, the missionaries kindly furnished them with instructors from their own body. The great revival was over and had left the natives more indifferent to religious instruction than before, so some other field of action had to be found for missionary energy. The Rev. Mr. Richards undertook to give lectures on law to the native chiefs, to show the importance of the proposed reforms. Dr. Anderson informs us that the worthy divine had no legal training, but was gifted with "sound common sense" and had really graduated from a Congregational seminary. To prevent any insinuations about interference in poli-

tics on the part of teachers of religion, the good man renounced the ministry and took charge of such papers and records as existed among the chiefs at a fair salary.

The first step towards a civilized government for the Hawaiians the missionaries decided ought to be a written constitution. The chiefs acquiesced trustfully, but as they did not know what a constitution was like, they asked their religious teachers to make one for them. The method adopted was unique in the history of legislation, as Dr. Anderson triumphantly declares. A school had been established at Lahainula six years before, when the reading "bees" of the first days went out of fashion. This school was intended to provide the mission with native assistants in teaching and other works, though natives were not considered by any means fit to become ordained ministers. To the pupils of this school the task of preparing a constitution was entrusted, and the document was produced within a couple of weeks. As given by Dr. Anderson, it is a curious jumble of extracts from the Old Testament, the Declaration of Independence and other generalities, coupled with shrewd provisions that lands should be allotted to individuals and sold at will and that new titles should overrule old ones. The King signed it as an act of his sovereign power, and things went on as before among the natives. However, Hawaii had a constitution. Three years later an English war vessel entered Honolulu and its captain, Lord Paulet, of his own authority declared the islands British territory. The act was subsequently disowned by the English admiral on the station and the British flag hauled down. Dr. Judd, the successor of good Mr. Richards, carefully hid the precious document in the mausoleum of Kamehameha during this crisis. His devotion to Hawaiian nationality is warmly commended by the mission historian.

More practical measures followed the constitution. There were over a hundred pupils in the mission seminary and small demand for them as teachers of religion. The chiefs were urged to set up a public school system, make the natives build school houses and compel universal attendance and payment for the teachers. An advantage of a constitutional system among untutored Polynesians that had not escaped the "sound common sense" of its inventor was that missionaries had to be called into the councils of the chiefs permanently to show how it should be worked. The compulsory school law was readily decreed under these circumstances, and Mr. Richards received control of the schools, under the title of Minister of Education. About a hundred pupils of the seminary were thus provided with salaries as mission dependents, and at the same time the other government offices were subjected to a large extent to the recommendation of the Minister of Instruction.

Another development promised to give the missionaries control of the future sovereigns of Hawaii. The old chiefs, of course, could not do more than follow directions in managing the government on the new plan. It was pointed out that their children ought to be trained specially for their future duties, and another missionary, Rev. Mr. Cooke, and his wife opened a royal boarding school, to which all the children with any prospect of royal succession should be sent at an early age. The last five native rulers were sent to this establishment young—in some cases at three or four years. According to Queen Liliuokalani, who was there, thrift was a marked feature of the Rev. Mr. Cooke's boarding school for royalty. She says the teachers forgot that growing children had appetites, and that the young Hawaiian scions of royalty had often to beg food from the cooks or forage in the garden for roots or leaves of plants. It is possible that this experience of New England thrift had some effect in spoiling the results hoped for in the way of ascendancy over the future Kings. All the pupils of the royal school showed in after life scanty affection for missionary influences. Their teacher, Mr. Cooke, kept his school for ten years and then quitted it and the ministry to go into mercantile business, in which he acquired a large fortune.

A Legislature, with parliamentary law and officers, was the next step taken towards the Christianization of Hawaii. However, as the chiefs were already accustomed to debating politics among themselves, its effect was not remarkable. The land regulations had a more important effect both on the condition of the natives and their missionary guides. The latter urged the wisdom of cutting up the lands into separate holdings. One-third was to be set apart in private property to the King and his successors. Another third was to be divided among the high chiefs, and the remainder among the people at large. The good Mr. Richards assisted in the division, as land surveying was not familiar to the natives and their metes and bounds were based on other methods. It was found when the chiefs had been satisfied by grants of the lands actually cultivated for them and the common people with such plots as they cared to work, that the words addressed to the original missionaries were fulfilled and that "very much land yet remained to be possessed." The missionaries suggested that this should be disposed of for the common benefit, and the suggestion was accepted by the still docile chiefs. Mr. Richards undertook to arrange the disposal. Dr. Judd took his place as Minister of Instruction and Mr. Richards went to Europe to obtain recognition from the various governments for the new constitutional kingdom and incidentally to make profitable disposition of the waste lands. The worthy ex-minister had already in

1841 made a contract with an American business firm—Ladd & Co.—giving them the right to lease any unoccupied lands at a nominal rent. He became a partner in the firm at the same time. On his European trip he organized a larger concern—the Royal Belgian Company—to which the concession of Ladd & Co. was transferred. In his zeal for the welfare of the new government, he considerably enlarged the privileges of the new company, so much so indeed that the foreign trade of the islands appeared to have been made a monopoly for its benefit. Its rights had ultimately to be bought out by the Hawaiian Government. Mr. Richards, it may be added, was one of the directors of the Royal Belgian Company. “Very much land yet remained to be occupied.”

Coined money had become a necessity for the new government, and it was coming in from the port dues and similar charges. The native lack of business training of course prevented the chiefs from knowing how to handle these revenues in civilized manner. Accordingly Dr. Judd, a medical missionary, was appointed Treasurer in 1846. Courts to settle the land titles were also found desirable and established in 1847. An American lawyer, devoted to the missionaries, happened fortunately to land about this time, and on missionary recommendation he was made Chief Justice. Another American became Attorney General and the form of a civilized government was rounded off by a Foreign Minister. A Scotchman, Mr. Wylie, received the last office. He was regarded as a true friend to the missionaries, but some remarks in Dr. Anderson's pages suggest that there was over much “canniness” in his Scotch nature. He subsequently induced Kamehameha IV. to set up an English High Church Bishop in Honolulu and declare himself an Episcopalian, to the deep disgust of the Congregational body.

While the missionaries were thus engaged in building up constitutional monarchy in Hawaii its people were wasting away. Their numbers dropped from 130,000 in 1830 to 108,000 in 1836, and to 84,000 in 1850. Forty years later they had dwindled to thirty-eight thousand. This unfortunate state of affairs began to cause grave doubts of the glowing statements regularly sent to America of the religious progress of the mission. Dr. Anderson mentions these criticisms and avoids any definite answer. “Whether the people might be represented as nationally christianized,” he declares, “was hard to say. There was no well defined opinion in the Christian mind at home as to what constitutes a national conversion.” After this remarkable statement of the intelligent zeal which had furnished funds for the “conversion” of the South Sea heathens he puts in his own description of what had actually been done in the way of imparting Christianity to them.

"While we see more of the foreign element than could be desired in the government of the islands, we are permitted to regard it as an independent and constitutional government, with a native sovereign at its head, as confessedly cognizant of God's law and the Gospel as any in Christian Europe, and with a community of self-governing churches embracing as large a proportion of the population and as really entitled to the Christian name as the churches of the most highly favored countries."

There is a strange contrast between Dr. Anderson's modest statement of the work accomplished and the enthusiastic congratulations embodied in the address to the public of a committee of members of Congress presided over by no less a person than ex-President John Quincy Adams.

The apparent candor of the secretary of the American Board of Foreign Missions was not without due motive. That body had been collecting large sums from the liberality of the Protestant public in return for the mission work done under its auspices. Over twelve hundred thousand dollars, we are told, was expended on the Hawaiian mission between 1819 and 1863. Conversion of heathens by modern methods is an expensive matter. There were twenty-seven ordained ministers and sixty American mission helpers laboring on the sunny shores of the Pacific islands in 1837. As the whole number of natives enrolled as Christians at any time scarcely reached eighteen thousand, it would seem that the labors of the missionaries can hardly have been excessive. Their remarkable longevity and the rapid growth of their families amid the decay of the native population point to the same conclusion. The latter circumstance, indeed, was frequently described in the Board reports as a special mark of the blessing of heaven on the great work. Some occurrences in 1848 induced a modification of this judgment. The children of missionaries in the islands had grown to a hundred and thirty by that year. Their parents began to think it might be well to bring a number of them home for education as the moral surroundings in the new Protestant Paraguay were decidedly unfavorable to their Christian training. Five missionaries, with twenty-five children, applied to the American Board to bring themselves and their families home and provide for them in America according to contract. Twelve more missionary families were ready to make the same demand the following year, and others would quickly follow. In fact, as Dr. Anderson tells us, "the prudential committee" found it likely that the mission would be abandoned by all its teachers within a few years if the latter could only get provision made for them at home as they expected. The alarms excited by this untoward prospect were appalling. Provision for twenty-five missionary families on a

style suitable to their requirements was a burden beyond the resources of the Board. It would also be strange to the public to learn that the mission which had been described as the triumph of modern evangelical methods should be left without even a pastor. The prudential committee declined to endorse the request of the five tired missionaries. They parleyed and inquired, and the historian tells us the results.

It would seem to ordinary eyes that it should be an easy task to find zealous teachers among American Protestants to take the place of the men whose success had been so remarkable. Such, however, was not the case. The old missionaries did not encourage any extension of the foreign element in the islands outside their own. They had secured most of the important offices and land concessions already, and they plainly stated that increase in the foreign element was not desirable. A native clergy might have been expected after twenty-five years of conversion such as had been pictured already, but on inquiry it appeared that the Christianity of the natives had not warranted the admission of any of them to the Protestant ministry. The converts went and came to church, as the government ordered, but seemed lacking in intelligent appreciation of any doctrines. It seems that of a total of fifty thousand converts who had been received as church members up to 1863 there were only eighteen thousand then left, or about a quarter of the actual population. As many more had died, for the longevity of the American teachers, some way, did not extend to their flocks. The others had dropped all semblance of connection with Protestant churches. In fact, though Dr. Anderson declines to admit it, a large number had become members of the long persecuted Catholic Church.

The moral effect of the modern mission methods on the natives is one of the strangest facts brought out by the discussion of the pension question for missionaries. Dr. Anderson acknowledges that the population was steadily declining and that its decline was caused by unrestrained licentiousness and disease introduced by the first English visitors. That the kind of teaching the missionaries had given had little effect in bringing in a higher morality than the old pagan one he admits, but he finds consolation in the assurance that if it had not been for the mission there would have been no natives whatever left in existence. "Something" had been done, he asserts, towards moral reformation, and he quotes a Rev. Dr. Gulick for the assertion that "female virtue was not unknown in Hawaii" after forty years of mission work. He turns from the unpleasant subject, however, with this brief testimony to vindicate the glories of mission work: "The nation may, and probably will, fade away. It will be forever true that the Sandwich Islands were Christianized by

evangelical mission from the United States, and that as a consequence the people *were recognized as entitled to the rank and privileges of a civilized nation.*" Such is the highest claim put forward by its chief promoters for the modern mission of Hawaii.

It was hardly to attain such results that the old Anglo-Saxon Catholic missionaries had labored in the forests of Germany or among the Vikings of Scandinavia. Boniface and the Ewalds did not lay their lives down that their converts might be "recognized as a civilized nation" and then perish from the effects of that civilization. Patrick did not win the Irish people to Christ that they might "fade away" from among the nations, nor did the Celtic Columbkille, the Polish Hyacinth, the Spanish Xavier or the French Brebœuf. Christianity is of no land or race. Its methods of propagation were given by the Redeemer in full perfection in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago, and they have been carried out by Catholic teachers during each succeeding century. If in pride of temporary power any nation attempts the task of Christian mission work on its own worldly methods the result will be the same as that of the American mission of Hawaii.

The material results of the mission in the shape of buildings and revenues were fully discussed by the prudential committee with the missionaries abroad. Churches were numerous, as they had been built with native labor imposed by the chiefs during the predominance of missionary influence. In 1870 the Protestant churches numbered a hundred and twenty for a membership of fifteen thousand. Dr. Anderson admits that they were far too numerous for the wants of the population. The missionary teachers had not forgotten the thrift which levied the price of the early tracts on the native recipients. Assessments for church uses were levied on the native converts to the full amount of their resources. Exclusive of labor and produce eighteen thousand dollars in gold was thus collected in 1848. It had been raised to thirty-one thousand dollars, rather more than two dollars a head, as Dr. Anderson triumphantly declares, in 1870. In the Philippines three years ago ten cents a head represented the cost of church and clergy to the natives, and thirteen hundred priests were laboring under a tropical sun on an average income of less than three hundred dollars each. Twenty times that amount was paid by the Hawaiian Protestant converts, but it was found insufficient to attract missionary successors to fill the places of their first instructors. The needs of missionaries of the modern "Anglo-Saxon" school are indeed different from those of Catholic friars. "A clerical missionary will do more towards promoting civilization by a well cultivated garden, a neat house, decent furniture and becoming clothing than fifty artisans." Such was the

sage recommendation of an English missionary deputation from Tahiti to the American Board in the beginnings of the Hawaiian mission. The Board was now finding by experience that such methods were a costly luxury, and it began to doubt the expediency of paying for them much longer.

Under these circumstances the prudence of ordaining natives as ministers was recognized by the white missionaries who were desirous of release from their functions. The first was ordained in 1849, and within twenty years later the number reached thirty-seven. Only eight white ministers then remained, and of the numerous missionary families but two had taken to the ministry. The others found more wealth in business pursuits and politics and were looked on with high favor in evangelical circles at home. The "missionary party" in Hawaii continued to hold its name long after the official close of the mission. How its members finally overthrew, by conspiracy with an unprincipled foreign Minister, the "civilized native government," the establishment of which, as Dr. Anderson states, was the one result of the Protestant mission, is an unpleasant historical episode of our own day. Its discussion would prolong this article beyond the limits of this essay.

The prudential committee of the American Board of Foreign Missions, on mature consideration, declined to bring home the missionary families. As a compromise it agreed to divide the property owned by the Board in the islands among the missionary residents. It further promised to continue salaries for some time to such as were not already "provided with adequate incomes from glebe lands, private property or the revenues of the native churches." Tentative attempts were made to group the latter into bunches with white pastors drawing salaries adequate to their dignity and native assistants doing the greater part of the work at stipends proportioned to native life; but these, as Dr. Anderson tells, "met only partial success." Thirty thousand dollars a year was no revenue to support a civilized modern clergy for fifteen thousand Hawaiians. Civilized labor is dearer in the tropics than in temperate climates, and the Board and the missionaries agreed that in the future the care of Hawaiian souls had better be left to the cheaper native pastors.

The original missionaries, however, were not left to absolute want. Kamehameha III. was pretty effectually controlled by ex-missionary ministers, and the public funds were drawn on freely to help out the donations of the American Board. There was a Protestant seminary at Lahamalu since 1844. The native government was got to take it over in the sense of providing funds for its support, while its control was vested in a self-filling Board of Trustees appointed by the

missionaries. A similar arrangement was made for the school for the children of the missionaries themselves. It became the Oahu College, with a liberal grant of valuable land to its trustees. A couple of other mission schools for natives were turned into private boarding schools, from which pure natives were excluded. These provided for a few more missionaries comparatively well. The royal school for natives was given up, but its missionary teacher, Rev. Mr. Cooke, engaged in business in Honolulu with another clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Castle. Both acquired sufficient wealth to take away any desire they might have had of returning to New England.

Though the risk of a wholesale return of missionaries was thus averted, the American Board felt anxious to get clear of its connection with Hawaii. They merely wished to retire with credit before the extinction of the nation, and they urged the establishment of a Hawaiian Board to attend to the spiritual interests of the islands in the meantime. They even advised that Hawaiian should be substituted for English as the official language of the mission and hinted, not obscurely, that prudence counseled the policy of leaving the natives to manage their own religion for the future. The missionaries in the islands acquiesced as they, too, found more tempting fields of work than preaching to natives. They had a new Constitution framed on stricter legal lines than the original semi-Scriptural document of the seminary pupils which had done duty for twelve years. Chief Justice Lee and two assistants prepared this document, which specially insisted on the rights of Cabinet officers in legislation in a constitutional kingdom. It may be noted that these gentlemen were Americans whose knowledge of monarchical institutions was theoretical. The document, however, was signed by the King as easily as the former. A large slice of the lands originally reserved as his private domain was also turned over to public use. A Rev. Mr. Armstrong entered the Cabinet as Minister of Instruction, and during the rest of Kamehameha III.'s reign the Ministry was wholly composed of foreign missionaries or their adherents.

On the death of Kamehameha III. his successor, who had been educated in the establishment of the Rev. Mr. Cooke, showed symptoms of restlessness under the missionary régime. Possibly the scanty fare of that Hawaiian Dotheboys' Hall had some part in his change of mind. A large defalcation was found in the Treasury, and three missionary ministers were required to resign in consequence. This incident is not mentioned in Dr. Anderson's history.

The New England Missionary Board, in view of this state of af-

fairs, had to continue its direction of Hawaiian Protestant church affairs till 1863. It did so reluctantly. The prudential committee endeavored to find a way to get out of the charge ten years earlier with some show of spiritual credit. Dr. Anderson says that in 1853 they "ventured on a somewhat jubilant announcement that the Sandwich Islands had been Christianized," but he adds "the fact does not seem to have been generally credited by the Board itself." Ten years later, during the excitement of the Civil War, the Board decided to take the establishment of a civilized native monarchy as sufficient proof that the mission work was completed. It felt that at all events it could do no more in the line of conversion and that it had exhausted the resources of the Anglo-Saxon civilization in that direction. A Hawaiian Board took full charge of the religious interests of the native population, and the New England mission was officially ended. Just thirty years later a faction of children of missionaries overthrew, by conspiracy with the Minister of a foreign power and the help of a foreign war vessel, the native civilized government. Mr. Dole, the son of a missionary teacher, was installed as President for life. The remnant of lands left to the native Kings was seized by force and the last native Queen sentenced to five years' imprisonment at hard labor for refusing obedience to the usurpers. Such was the end of the mission's work.

The methods adopted by the Protestant missionaries in Hawaii are identical with those of nearly every Protestant mission among the natives of the Pacific islands. In New Zealand, in Tonga, the Society Islands, Fiji and every other group which has been subjected to Protestant influence similar methods have been employed, and the result has been the same. The disappearance of the native population and the occupation of their lands by the missionaries and their families as rulers has followed as the result of Protestant philanthropy. It is worthy of serious reflection that in the islands where Catholic teachers were accepted, and in those alone, the native population has not decayed. Wallis, Futuna and the Gambier Islands are peopled by the same race as Hawaii. They have become Christian, and they have steadily increased in population since. The Philippines when Legaspi visited them in 1568 were estimated to have a population of about half a million. Hawaii when Cook brought it first under the notice of English civilization was credited with nearly four hundred thousand. To-day it has less than forty thousand of the native race. The Filipino Catholics number over seven millions. The facts are indisputable and speak for themselves.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

IL DIALOGO DI GALILEO GALILEI LINCEO.

I.

WE feel that some apology is due to our readers for inviting their attention to a subject that has been so much discussed and so warmly controverted as the action of the Congregations of the Index and the Inquisition with regard to Galileo; but the fact is that, whether we desire it or not, it is revived at intervals, sometimes by hostile or perhaps even friendly critics, sometimes by biographers or scientific writers; so that we venture to think it a matter of importance that Catholics should be acquainted at least with the principal facts of the case, as also with the force and bearing of the decisions of the Roman Congregations on the Copernican theory of astronomy and its supposed antagonism to Holy Scripture.

But a further apology may be expected from the present writer, because in a little work published in London some years ago, and bearing the title of "Galileo and His Judges," he endeavored to state briefly but sufficiently the circumstances that occurred, and also to deal with the false inferences drawn from them by opponents of the Church and other misguided persons. It may therefore be considered questionable taste on his part to revert to the subject; but (as has been just explained) it is not unfrequently revived by others, new objections being made, or old ones re-stated; whilst, on the other side, fresh information has been acquired; and, last but not least, some little modification of the argument formerly used has appeared desirable.*

Under these circumstances it has been impossible to avoid repeating here, though in a condensed form, a great part of the narrative as given in the work just mentioned; and this also applies to the abbreviated précis of the celebrated Dialogue, a fuller abstract of which is to be found in the same work. The author of this article must therefore throw himself on the mercy of his readers, and beg them to pardon such unavoidable repetitions, and to excuse the apparent egotism (unintentional let him assure them) of referring to his own previous writings. He may take this opportunity of remarking

*The apology of the writer is probably not so much required for American readers, because he is not so presumptuous as to think that his work, published in England, has ever had any appreciable circulation on the far side of the Atlantic.

that his treatment of the decisions of the Roman Congregations is different from that adopted by some Catholic apologists; but, relying on the opinions received from very able theologians, he feels confident that such treatment is in full accordance with Catholic principles and with the spirit of dutiful obedience to the Holy See.

With this explanatory preface, we now proceed to the questions which appear to us the most important to answer.

The attack on the Catholic Church by those who use the Galileo case as a weapon may be stated thus: The Congregation of the Index in the year 1616 prohibited and condemned a printed letter by a Carmelite Father Paul Anthony Foscarini, in which "the said Father endeavours to show that the aforesaid doctrine of the immobility of the Sun in the centre of the Universe and the mobility of the Earth is consonant to the truth, and is not opposed to Holy Scripture," and also prohibited "*all other books* teaching the same thing." The "aforesaid doctrine" referred to what the Sacred Congregation termed "that false Pythagorean doctrine, altogether contrary to Holy Scripture, concerning the movement of the Earth and the immobility of the Sun taught by Nicolas Copernicus, etc., . . . already spread about and received by many persons," and the object of the decree was "lest any opinion of this kind insinuate itself to the detriment of Catholic truth." This decree, though not officially stated to have been approved by the Pope (Paul V.), undoubtedly received his approval: in fact, before the promulgation of the decree the Pope had desired Cardinal Bellarmine to send for Galileo and admonish him to abandon the opinion in question and no longer to teach it, which admonition, it seems, he promised to obey.

This action on the part of the Congregation of the Index is, of course, not all. The indictment against Rome is also founded on the proceedings taken by the Inquisition in 1633 against Galileo on account of the publication of his famous Dialogue; and this in fact is the chief thing that has taken hold of the popular imagination (so far as the popular imagination takes in the subject at all), and this again partly arises from the theatrical story, not based on fact, of the old philosopher stamping his foot on the earth and saying, "*E pur si muove*," after his enforced abjuration of the Copernican theory.

It is also alleged that a Bull of Alexander VII., published in 1664, and authorizing a new Index in the place of the old one, gave a special sanction to the former decree prohibiting all works teaching the Copernican theory, because it includes that decree amongst many others, and also the monitum of 1620 ordering certain corrections in the work of Copernicus, and containing in its preamble a statement that the principles of Copernicus relating to the move-

ment of the Earth were contrary to the true and Catholic interpretation of Holy Scripture; as also all works teaching the movement of the Earth and the immobility of the Sun.

Before proceeding to answer these arguments, it may be well to give a brief sketch of the life and character of Galileo, or Galileo Galilei Linceo, to give him his name in full. He was born at Pisa in 1564, and after studying mathematics and physical science at the University of that place, he came to Florence, when about 21 years of age, in order to go through a mathematical course. Though the greater part of his life was irreproachable, it appears that while still very young he fell into sin and formed an illicit attachment to a lady named Maria Gamba, and lived with her a few years, having three children by her; but this *liaison* did not last very long, and a separation took place, after which he saw her no more. He then entered the monastery of Vallombrosa, but left it before his novitiate was completed, having no vocation for the religious state. At the age of 25 he was appointed professor of mathematics at Pisa, and it seems that it was at that time that he first excited hostility by attacking the doctrines of Aristotle on physical sciences. He had also heard of the invention of the telescope, then recently constructed for the first time in Holland or Belgium; and from what he had heard or read he contrived to make a telescope for himself, of a very simple kind, no longer in use for telescopes, though the principle of it is identical with that of binocular field glasses and other similar instruments. Simple, however, as it was, it was sufficient to reveal to a careful observer phenomena hitherto unknown. Galileo was able by this means to discover the satellites of Jupiter (that is four of them, for the fifth has been only discovered quite recently); also the moon-like phases of the planet Venus; the rings of Saturn, and the spots on the Sun; these last having been observed about the same time by the Jesuit Father Scheiner, and by Fabricius. He does not, however, appear to have published the results of his labors until the year 1610, when his work called "*Nuntius Siderius*" was printed. In 1611 he went to Rome and was well received by the Pope and by other eminent prelates; in 1612 he published another work entitled "*Discorso sui Gallegianti*;" and so far he met with general approval, notwithstanding a certain amount of opposition. In the year 1613 he brought out another work at Rome, called "*L'Istoria e Dimonstrazione intorno alle Macchie Solari*," in which he drew a conclusion in favor of the revolution of the Earth on its axis. Even this was generally well received, and Galileo might have escaped censure had he not allowed himself to be drawn into another question—the reconciling the Copernican theory with the interpretation of Holy Scripture. Prudence and reticence do not

seem to have been features in Galileo's character; the temptation, we must allow, to embark in this part of the controversy was doubtless great, and the provocation considerable. It was not he, but his opponents, who began the argument from Scripture; and when Father Cassini, a Dominican, made an attack on the Copernican theory from the pulpit of the Church of Sta. Maria Novella at Florence, instead of leaving the Scriptural difficulty to be argued by theologians, he wrote a letter, an imprudent and unguarded letter apparently, to Father Castelli, a Benedictine monk, in reply to the Dominican preacher. The result was that his letter was denounced to the Cardinal Prefect of the Index. No actual steps were, however, taken until two or three years after the publication of the letter, but in the year 1615 a process was commenced, which finally led to the decree of the Congregation of the Index, to which we have already alluded. Galileo unfortunately could not be persuaded even then to keep himself quiet; he came to Rome, mixed in society and argued his case to the best of his power. This conduct gave offense in high quarters and the Pope was evidently displeased. The result was that in February, 1616, two propositions, supposed to deserve censure, were referred to the "Qualificators," as they are termed, of the Holy Office—theologians attached to the Congregation of the Inquisition, but of less position and dignity than the "Consultors."

The propositions were: First, That the Sun was the centre of the world and consequently immovable locally. Second, That the Earth was not the centre of the world, nor immovable, but moved round itself by a diurnal rotation. The Qualificators pronounced the first opinion to be foolish and absurd, philosophically speaking, and also formally heretical, as it contradicted Holy Scripture according to the proper meaning of the words, and the ordinary interpretation, and the sense admitted by the Fathers and others. They also pronounced the second opinion to be deserving of the same censure philosophically, and, regarding theological truth, to be at least erroneous in point of faith. It seems to us indeed strange that learned men should even at that date, nearly 300 years ago, have committed themselves to these opinions; but we must bear in mind the fact that astronomy (as we now understand it) was then in its infancy, and can scarcely be said to have attained to its maturity until the great discovery of the law of universal gravitation, about half a century later. We need not, however, pause to discuss the opinions of the Qualificators, for although they had a good deal of influence on the subsequent proceedings, they are simply to be taken for what they are worth—the judgment of certain grave and learned theologians—and have no official weight. But they had this consequence, that the Pope desired Cardinal Bellarmine to send for

Galileo and admonish him to abandon the obnoxious opinion; if he refused to obey, he was to be solemnly warned and commanded to abstain from teaching such doctrines, and from defending them, or treating of them. In case of his non-acquiescence, he was to be imprisoned. Galileo, however, promised to obey.

Shortly afterwards there appeared the printed decree of the Index of which we have already spoken. It is noteworthy that no work of Galileo's was mentioned by name, though *all books* teaching that the doctrine of the immobility of the Sun in the centre of the Universe and the mobility of the Earth was in accordance with Holy Scripture, were forbidden. Galileo had influential friends in Rome, and there was probably a disposition to spare him personally, provided the much dreaded Copernican theory could be stamped out. How different the final events were we need not point out; but that this feeling existed in high quarters at that time is evident, for in March, 1616, the month following the publication of the decree of the Index, Galileo had an audience of the Pope, in which he assured him of the rectitude of his intentions, and complained of the persecutions of his antagonists. Paul V., it is stated, answered very kindly, saying that both he himself and the Cardinals of the Index had formed a high personal opinion of him, and did not believe his calumniators.

On the death of the Pope, about six years after these events, Cardinal Barberini was elected as his successor, taking the name of Urban VIII. The new Pope had always been friendly to Galileo, and on the occasion of his visit to Rome in 1624 received him and treated him with very great consideration. It seems, in fact, that Urban VIII. had several conversations with him and discussed the Copernican theory, and in doing so employed some of those arguments which the imprudent philosopher afterwards put into the mouth of Simplicio, a character in the ill-fated Dialogue, thereby causing great offense to the Pope. There was clearly a partial reaction in Galileo's favor at that period; he had published a work since the decree of the Index, entitled "*Il Saggiatore*," in which he had favored the theory of the Earth's motion; an attempt was made to have the work prohibited, or corrected, but this attempt was a failure. Some reputed conversations of Urban VIII., of a private and non-official character, point in the same direction. For instance, he is reported to have said on being told that certain Germans were ready to become Catholics, but hesitated on account of the condemnation of Copernicus, that this was not his intention, and if he had had the arrangement of matters the decree would never have been made. Galileo somewhat overrated the effect of the reaction, such as it was, and as time went on he thought he might

safely publish the Dialogue on which he had been laboring. He came to Rome in 1630, and had a long audience of the Pope, who treated him very kindly and even increased a pension he had already bestowed on him. He also saw Father Riccardi, who had become Master of the Sacred Palace—the holder of which important position was then, and still is, the official censor of books—and desired from him the authority to print his book. The following circumstances deserve special notice because they throw some light on the strange fact that the Dialogue bore on the face of it the Ecclesiastical permission to publish it, and that it was nevertheless afterwards prohibited and its author severely censured.

Father Visconti, who was a professor of mathematics, had been engaged to read the work, and he reported that there were some passages in it that required correction, and many points that he would like to discuss with the author. Still, the Master of the Sacred Palace gave leave for the printing of the work, stating at the same time a wish to see it once again himself; so it was arranged that Galileo should return to Rome in the autumn in order to add the preface and to insert in the body of the work certain additions calculated to show that the question of Copernicanism was treated purely as a hypothesis. But owing to some untoward events, and particularly an outbreak of the plague at Florence, delays and mistakes occurred.

It was arranged that the Dialogue should be duly revised by the proper ecclesiastical authorities at Florence, and should then be printed there. After some further delays on both sides the Inquisitor of Florence received from Rome the power to approve officially the copy of Galileo's work that would be submitted to him; but some instructions were added by Father Riccardi that the wishes of the Pope must be borne in mind as to certain points. The title of the work must indicate that it dealt only with the mathematical question connected with Copernicanism, and also that the Copernican opinion must not be put forward as a positive truth, but only as a hypothesis, and this without alluding to the interpretation of Scripture; moreover, that it should be stated that the work was written to show that when the decree of 1616 was made at Rome the authorities were not ignorant of the reasons on the other side. The preface as it stands embodies these very ideas, and certainly reads as if it were a piece of bitter irony; but we do not know how much was written by Father Riccardi and how much by Galileo; it was probably their joint composition. Galileo proceeds to state that for the purpose in hand he had taken the Copernican part in the Dialogue as a pure mathematical hypothesis, but endeavoring to represent it as superior to the doctrine as defended by the Peri-

patetics, to whom he alludes with some contempt—an imprudent thing to do, considering how strong that party—the party who put their implicit trust in Aristotle—was in Rome at that time. We do not propose to give here a full précis of the famous Dialogue; if we may be permitted without presumption to say so, it will be found in the work to which we have already alluded, “Galileo and His Judges.” We may, however, give a brief explanation of its structure and its contents. There are three interlocutors—Salviati, Sagredo and Simplicio; they are supposed to meet at Venice at the palazzo of Sagredo. The best arguments are put into the mouth of Salviati, a mathematician and a man of science. Simplicio sustains the anti-Copernican side; the name was an unfortunate one to choose for him, for it was obviously not meant as a compliment, and is supposed to have given great offense to Urban VIII., since (as remarked above) he had used in arguing with Galileo some of the same reasons that are put into the mouth of Simplicio: so at least the story goes, and it does seem probable that the Pope was persuaded to think that some grave disrespect to himself was implied by this circumstance. Nevertheless, Simplicio, though he is made to say certain unwise things, is not by any means a simpleton in our sense of the word; he is a follower of Aristotle, whom he constantly quotes, and is a type of the school of the Peripatetics (as they were called), slightly caricatured perhaps in this way by our philosopher, who had little respect for them. It seems, however, incredible that he should have intended to insult the Pope, whom he had every reason to conciliate, and who had long been kindly and amicably disposed towards him.

The Dialogue is divided into four parts, one part to each day. The second and third days are the best, and contain the ablest arguments which the astronomical knowledge of that time allowed of for the Copernican system. Thus Salviati urges forcibly the improbability of the motion of the whole celestial sphere, including such a number of vast bodies, revolving with an immense velocity round the earth in 24 hours; whilst the earth turning round on itself would produce the same effect. This argument, good and sound even then, is still more cogent now that we know something of the distances of the heavenly bodies; for Galileo did not know the distance or the size of the Sun, the former of which he estimated at 1,208 semi-diameters of the Earth, which would be rather more than 4,800,000 miles, about one-nineteenth part of the true distance; and when we consider the stars, the nearest of which (so far as we know) is so far from us that light, traveling as it does with a speed that has been estimated at 186,000 miles in a second, takes nearly four years to reach the Earth from the Star Alpha Centauri, what was at the

date of the Dialogue violently improbable appears now simply incredible and almost impossible. But it took some time to disabuse men's minds of the antiquated opinion, founded on ideas which prevailed before the invention of the telescope, that the stars and planets were set in vast movable spheres, as lamps might be set in a revolving cupola. One of the favorite reasons which the adherents of the old system employed against the revolution of the Earth on its axis was that the Earth if it so revolved would leave the air behind it. Galileo was doubtless aware that the Earth could carry the air round with it in its diurnal rotation; but as far as we can judge from the Dialogue, he did not clearly understand the true reason, namely, the *gravity* of the air. He had not freed himself from the old but mistaken notion that some bodies were *essentially* heavy and others light, the latter having no tendency to descend; whereas we now know that all bodies are subject to the action of gravity, and that the light bodies are so only in a comparative sense; he, in fact, had but an imperfect knowledge of gravity, though he recognized it as a mysterious force drawing heavy bodies towards the centre of the earth; and in one remarkable passage of the Dialogue he appears to have half suspected that this same force controlled the moon in its revolution round the Earth; which great truth, if he had really and fully known, he would have anticipated the important discovery of Newton. It is, however, probable that he became aware of the gravity of the air later on, for he lived some ten or twelve years after writing this work, and his mind was never in a state of stagnation, but open to the acquirement of fresh scientific knowledge. And yet it is curious that when he wrote the Dialogue he adhered to the mistaken opinion that the heavenly bodies move in circles, though Kepler's work containing the theory (now so well established) of their motion in elliptical orbits, was published some years before the printing of the Dialogue. We may add that the common opinion of the philosophers of the Copernican school of that age was that the adherence of the atmosphere to the Earth as it revolved was the effect of friction. An instance, we may observe, can be found in the Dialogue showing that whatever the author's guesses or suspicions were as to the force and nature of gravity, he was far from comprehending the true doctrine as afterwards propounded by Newton; he puts into the mouth of Salviati the argument that bodies which emit light, as the Sun and Stars do, are essentially different from those which, like the Earth and the planets, have no such property; and that the Earth in this respect resembles the planets which are undoubtedly moving, and is therefore probably also itself in motion, whilst the Sun and Stars remain at rest.

Ideas such as these, plausible though they seemed at that time, are entirely contrary to the theory of universal gravitation, according

to which the luminosity and opaqueness of any two heavenly bodies have nothing whatever to do with their relative motion, which latter depends entirely on their respective *masses*. But Galileo, though he had not arrived at the knowledge of this great scientific truth, could explain ably and powerfully by the medium of this same *Salviati* the grounds for believing the Sun and not the Earth to be the centre of revolution. He takes it as certain that the two planets Mercury and Venus revolve round the Sun, the phases of Venus, which he had himself observed, showing it to be the case with regard to that planet, and the fact that neither of the two is ever seen far apart from the Sun, strengthening the conclusion as to both of them. Then, that being so, he shows what strong ground there is for inferring that the superior planets Mars, Jupiter and Saturn (the only ones then known) revolve also round the Sun; their greater apparent size, particularly that of Mars, when on the opposite side of the Earth from the Sun, clearly pointing to this conclusion and proving that the Earth is not the centre of their orbits. He also explains how the telescope revealed phenomena such as the phases of Venus, which were unknown to Copernicus. *Simplicio*, as we might well conjecture, has had no confidence hitherto in this new instrument, and following his friends, the Peripatetic philosophers, has supposed the appearance to be optical illusions; he is, however, willing to be corrected if in error.

To the objection that the Earth could not be well imagined to move round the Sun accompanied by the Moon, *Salviati* replies that Jupiter does so, accompanied by four moons.

Simplicio, however, does bring forward one weighty objection to the Copernican system, namely, that if the Earth really makes an annual revolution round the Sun, the fixed Stars, viewed as they would be at different seasons of the year from points so widely distant, would be naturally expected to change their apparent positions in the heavens. At a time when the real distances of the heavenly bodies were not known, that was a formidable difficulty, and if it had been understood that the diameter of the Earth's orbit was about 185,000,000 miles in length, it would have been more formidable still. Galileo's reply (through *Salviati*) is nevertheless sound and correct in principle, though founded on inaccurate data, and amounts to this, that the distance of the stars is so great, that the change of position caused by the Earth's annual motion round the Sun is not appreciable. This was rigidly true so far as all instruments then available were concerned; but the modern answer to the difficulty would be somewhat different; the greatly improved instruments now in use have shown that a certain number of the Stars do actually undergo a minute displacement every year, or in the lan-

guage of astronomy have an *annual parallax*, while as to the great bulk of the Stars the same answer as that given by Salviati still applies.

Some pains are taken in the course of the Dialogue to explain how the Stars in their different positions would be affected by annual parallax, if it existed, and supposing it to be discoverable. And a minute explanation is also given, on the assumption of the Earth's motion, of the variation of the length of day and night in different latitudes according to the seasons; these familiar details (as they now appear to us) being strange to the minds even of learned men in those days.

The last day's Dialogue is mainly devoted to the argument drawn from the tides, and we need not dwell at any length on this, as it is well known to be erroneous. Galileo would have been wise if he had never touched upon a matter of which he had very little practical knowledge and of which he did not understand the theory. There was, nevertheless, some ingenuity in his idea, and any one who is interested in such matters will find it explained in the *précis* of the Dialogue, already mentioned, if they think it worth the trouble to refer to it. We may say briefly that his suggestion was that as the Earth has two motions, one round its own axis in 24 hours and the other round the Sun in one year, that part of the surface of the globe which is turned away from the Sun moves through space more rapidly than the part which by means of the diurnal revolution is turned in the contrary direction; and so the sea lying in its vast basin gets a check or a jerk as it passes from one rate of velocity to the other. Galileo had not learnt (as he would if he had lived for a time at some place on our own coasts) that the tides follow the *lunar* day rather than the solar one, and it is remarkable that a man who was better acquainted with mechanics and the laws of motion than almost any man of his age should have failed to perceive that the ocean could undergo no such jerk or check as supposed, but must be carried round in the daily rotation of the Earth (unless interfered with by the attraction of other bodies) with an uniform velocity. Simplicio is justified in putting (as he does) the difficulty that if the sea behaved in the way suggested, the air would do so on the same principle; the reply to which is that the air being thin and light is less adherent to the Earth than the water, which is heavier and so does not follow the Earth's movements in the same way; also that where it is not hemmed in, as it were, by mountains and other obstacles, it really is partially left behind in the daily rotation, so that in the neighborhood of the tropics a constant wind blows from east to west.

Our philosopher had evidently heard of the trade winds, but

had not acquired an accurate knowledge of their course and origin. We have, however, now said enough of this mistaken argument connected with the tides, and we may add that it is not the only mistake in the treatment of the subject, as we have already seen. But notwithstanding all this, we have also seen that some very sound and cogent reasons in favor of the Copernican theory were urged in the Dialogue—reasons as valid now as they were then, though they have been supplemented by others, drawn from subsequent discoveries and especially that of the law of universal gravitation.

But it must be admitted that Galileo failed in one respect: if a disputed theory is to be handled in this way and to be argued out under the form of a dialogue, the case on both sides ought to be stated fairly and fully. This, we fear, was not done in the present instance; for Simplicio, though by no means a fool, is yet a personage who makes a comparatively poor figure in a scientific argument. We pass over one or two interesting questions that are discussed between the three friends, as they do not bear directly on the great point at issue. And we may now explain that we have directed our readers' attention to the Dialogue, giving what we may perhaps venture to call an abridged précis of it, because it is not possible to form a correct judgment of Galileo's history and the treatment he underwent without some acquaintance with the work for which he was so severely censured. His great ability, his knowledge of mechanics and his grasp (as one remarkable passage indicates) of the principles of pure mathematics are conspicuous throughout the Dialogue, notwithstanding the mistakes to which we have alluded and others also, some of which arose out of the old Aristotelian philosophy, a philosophy not without influence over even his enlightened mind. We must also bear in mind that a dialogue, though a convenient form of argument in some respects, does not always give us a clear insight into the author's real convictions. You do not know for certain whether he agrees with any of the interlocutors; and in fact Galileo in his defense before the Inquisition practically assumes that he did not so agree. But it is obviously a good method of stating arguments *pro* and *con*, when the writer is one whose opinions are intended to be expressed in a tentative shape, and possibly our philosopher's mind was then in a state congenial to such expression; this, we think, is not inconsistent with the fact that he shows an evidently strong bias in favor of the Copernican theory. A strong bias towards a probable opinion is one thing; a clear conviction is another. The first was from a scientific point of view the natural state of mind for an observer of the heavens in the early part of the seventeenth century; the second is the attitude of the modern astronomer.

There have been writers who in their zeal to defend the action of

the Roman Congregations have expressed themselves as if Galileo had no substantial ground for his leaning to the Copernican doctrine, but almost entirely relied on the argument which he drew from the tides; but these writers have not studied the Dialogue or made themselves acquainted with its contents. It has been said that this mistaken argument was his favorite one. That may possibly be true, but it was not by any means his only one, as the Dialogue clearly proves; and indeed the man who was the first to use the telescope for astronomical purposes must have had better reasons than that of the tides for the conclusions he drew.

Some people appear to think that it was merely the discovery of the law of universal gravitation by Newton that overthrew the old system of astronomy. It is quite true that that great event threw a flood of light upon the subject and gave us a key to the motions of the heavenly bodies. Dr. Whewell in an eloquent passage in his "History of the Inductive Sciences" calls it "indisputably and incomparably the greatest scientific discovery ever made;" and that owing to it "astronomy passed at once from its boyhood to mature manhood." It is none the less true that the death warrant of the old systems of Ptolemy and Aristotle was in effect signed when the telescope was turned upon the heavens. The old system did not die at once; it took a long time to realize the lessons to be drawn from the discoveries of Galileo and others, for it was only the experts who could fully appreciate them; but the fact remains that when the telescope was invented Ptolemy was doomed.

To us, who are separated from the events of that period by an interval of rather more than two centuries and a half, it may seem strange and incomprehensible that such a work as Galileo's Dialogue should have given serious offense to the ecclesiastical authorities at Rome; for owing to the very fact of its being a dialogue, though the case for the Copernican theory was persuasively stated, no certain conclusion was drawn; and it had, moreover, received the official approbation of the Master of the Sacred Palace. But the disciples of the School of Aristotle were powerful at Rome, and they could not endure anything that tended to demolish the scientific infallibility of that ancient philosopher. It appears that Father Scheiner, writing to Gassendi, observed that Galileo had written "*Contra communem Peripateticorum sensum.*" Then there was also the strong current of theological opinion which regarded the Copernican doctrine as contrary to Scripture, an opinion grounded on the rigidly literal interpretation of certain texts. And there was, too, the unfortunate circumstance that the Pope had been persuaded that a personal affront was offered to him by putting arguments he had himself used into the mouth of "Simplicio."

So the agitation against the Dialogue was successful. The printing of the work was suspended by orders from the Master of the Sacred Palace; and the Inquisitor of Florence, by the command of the Pope, directed Galileo to present himself in Rome in order to explain his conduct.

F. R. WEGG-PROSSER.

London, England.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

AN Irishman writes this for English-speaking Catholics in the United States, who are mostly of Irish descent. I was not long since in a Canadian city, and a priest of Irish name, face and parentage was giving some facts, which seem strangely forgotten by some who think America *vs.* England still means freedom *vs.* slavery. Are we all quite sure we know what the facts are of this present world?

"American priests come over here," said this Canadian Catholic High School manager, "and they begin by pitying us, who, alas! say they, are under England, and in the hotbed of Orange intolerance. They do not live far away; the border is not far off; but they live very ignorant of their northern neighbors. They go home wiser, and certainly sadder. For what does a short visit teach them? That in Ontario their brethren tell them they have nothing to complain of. The American priests think of their flocks paying twice for schools, taxing themselves to support unsectarian, and therefore generally irreligious schools, and then paying for their own schools, which at least aim at not letting the young grow up ashamed of God and holiness. What is a greater matter? What does the Church think a greater matter? Well, under England's monarchy, in Ontario, as in Ireland, with modifications, as in a limited way in England itself, you give your education and you get government pay, the money of your own taxes as Catholics, and you pay not at all for any other schools. So that in Ireland the clergy can say education is practically 'denominational,' the parish priest is the manager of the school, and we are satisfied with the system at least. In England the Catholics have not given up one of their schools, having satisfied in every case the conditions of receiving grants from Her Majesty's Government. So our American priests return to a Republic—alas!—to receive no

cent for their schools, no matter how excellent in secular instruction, from the country that claims us all as free and equal. Then from the Republic across the ocean, from liberty, equality and fraternity, comes the same story, with French parents increasing in number, who to save their children from less godly and more vicious surroundings daily withdraw them in greater numbers from the non-Christian, or anti-Christian schools, which alone get all the grants, all the taxes.

As he takes up an Irish-American paper our priest will perhaps see a denunciation of England for withholding the grant from the Christian Brothers' successful schools in Ireland, because of their books not approved by the Board of Education, and the religious emblems of crucifix, holy picture and statue, which—thank God—the Brothers have not found it necessary to put away from the boys' sight all the week. But even these religious, together with Jesuits and all others, share largely, according to their great success, in the exhibitions and prizes given by the English Government for the higher education of boys.

But the protest of our Irish-American against the government in Ireland for intolerance in one case might be swelled into protests against the government in America in the whole system of secondary education.

Facts are facts. "Things are as they are; and their consequences will be what they will be"—one obvious consequence already being that Canadian clergy of Irish descent are becoming more and more blended with Englishism. Who will blame them? Why should they wish their people to be double taxed for schools? They protest, naturally, against a local injustice in Manitoba; but why should they wish injustice done to their people all over? That injustice they will find if they leave the English flag and join the American. We may storm about England's influence, against her imperial strength; we may scoff at Irishmen and Frenchmen who submit more and more cheerfully to her rule. Let us ask these Catholics, descendants of the persecuted and once themselves anti-English it may be, why it is that they thus submit.

Take French Canada. Here is an incident of last year. To Montreal came a religious from France and published an article in *La Semaine Religieuse*, calling upon his Canadian cousins to observe the great anti-Catholic power, England—as if the good monk had just awakened from a sleep of 150 years, when Protestant England fought with Catholic France—to observe how this England was tormenting and torturing the Catholics of Manitoba, and how French Catholics must watch their moment; must long for the day of retribution or vengeance, and must pray for the downfall of England as

the enemy of God's Church. And this from a French monk, a monk from France, where laws worthy of England's old penal laws have been passed in this generation, whence a few years ago French monks poured once more into England to find there freedom to set up their monasteries how and where they would and to educate Catholic children without paying for the education of non-Catholics. Hear it, O Americans, O Irish-Americans, who remember when your fathers were paying tithes to the Protestant ministers to support services you could not go to, though in your own old churches, abbeys or cathedrals. That was hard, that was unjust; but what they did for the non-Catholic minister under England before she mended her ways, are not you doing now under America, America of to-day, for the non-Catholic schoolmaster?

It is true England still has rascally laws on the statute book—against the religious and their holy habit. Nor are these all a dead letter, as when lately the Irish Chancellor declared to a Jesuit novice of wealth that he was joining an illegal society. Still, England pays her money—or her Irish subjects' money—to Jesuit schools that do good work. It is true also that she keeps some of her high offices insultingly closed to Catholics, while she preaches that she gives equal rights to all. Worse than that, the sovereigns take a brutal and blasphemous oath against the faith of St. Augustine and Alfred, St. Thomas and Henry the Fifth, Queen Katherine and Queen Mary. Our Presidents do not so. But what sort of ignorant no-Popery do we find they sometimes listen to? And ask the praiser of free and equal America whether he in his millions will vote for every seventh President a Catholic; or say every seventieth, lest he say we would be having a man elected for his religion merely.

No-Popery! Why, in many respects our average American that makes a stir in the world, business man, politician, journalist, essayist, professor or poet, is fifty years behind the English. With his A. P. A., and his "famous" preachers, and philanthropists, he is, on his controversial side, something like the 1850 English of Papal Aggression, or like Belfast Orangemen of to-day, or the stolid bourgeois Puritans of England and Scotland, who have not this American's pretense to be emancipated from prejudice, and who keep Irish Catholic boys out of universities with the same persistency that they are one with Americans in keeping Catholics out of Senates and Parliaments.

All one can say to those Irish-Americans who forget nothing and learn nothing about England is, just try the school laws of this land to which the Statue of Liberty guides you; just try them in the land of Cardinal Logue and Archbishop Walsh. Propose further that the government shall withdraw all grants from reformatories and

industrial schools in Ireland managed by religious men and women. Of course, to further assimilate ourselves to America, the nuns will have gone already from the "public schools." Then to liken Ireland to the other Republic that gave the Liberty Statue—"Oh, Liberty, what crimes have been done in thy name!"—the English Government will not see that the Catholic soldiers go in a body to the Catholic churches, but will rather forbid that any English soldiers shall appear in a body at Mass. French soldiers are not allowed thus to appear. And Republics surely talk much about liberty, and ought to know what it is.

Does the American Government distribute thousands of Catholic prayer books to its Catholic soldiers? Does the French? The English does.

The fact of it is, as was said by an honest fellow born in an "Irish" settlement on this side of the Atlantic, when his grandparents anyway were from the old country, in worse days—he said that "the people where I am would not believe these things"—would not believe in Lord Russell, a Catholic Chief Justice in England, nor in government schools suiting the priests in Ireland, nor in Catholic processions through English streets. No wonder. For not long since these last would have been stoned—their chief organizer says, by the way, that "it was the once persecuted Salvation Army that won the battle for our Catholic processions"—and in this century a Lord Chamberlain insulted a young Catholic lady of rank who appeared at court. And I have heard a poor old Irishwoman in America tell of how the mission fathers in her parish "at home," in County Armagh, were attacked in the church and had to escape from the town before their mission was ended, fifty odd years ago.

But how long are we going on believing that we are living two generations back? English or American Colonial soldiers certainly drove the Acadian French Catholics out of house and home—before that again. Hence even to-day France is Catholicism for their descendants. Simple folk often—they would scarce believe that England shelters exiled French monks; that in France a bishop was last year fined for going a few steps in his vestments from his palace to his church—that was an illegal procession—that their young seminarians have to serve in barracks. Would they believe it? Would the Newfoundland fishermen believe that the French Government has forbidden French sailors to take note of Good Friday? Those who know these things may not have the heart to tell their brethren. And one may well respect their sad reserve.

But when the French monk came to Canada to denounce England, that shelters him and his from his own intolerant France, the

French Canadian Archbishop promptly declared that the Frenchman's article was untrue and absurd and opposed to anything he would allow published with his episcopal sanction.

When we are considering England's relations to her colonies, when we are watching events in Ireland and abroad, we must stand in the world as it is to-day, and judge just judgment accordingly. Otherwise we shall see all amiss.

There is another great change that has come in England—the change in the Anglican religion—and that, too, has created new conditions, new affinities, new possibilities. This is still a change going on and a cause of great confusion. But it has revolutionized English art and architecture, has affected poetry and turned histories inside out, and has suggested, if unconsciously, a return to many good things in the ideal of Catholic society. Care for the poor, and solidarity in social work, and the use of natural means for keeping people, young and old, in a decency and in occupied leisure which will at least predispose towards things higher, and at the very least keep out of vice—all this good has been stirred up and helped in modern Protestantism by various religious movements, and among them by the one we speak of, which has also touched men and life by the side of that reverence to which Catholicism has never ceased to appeal.

Talking first of such work as that of the Y. M. C. A., a man who much dislikes its tone, yet allowed that in his wanderings as an engineer in large English towns he could see that the Y. M. C. A. rooms were usually the only refuges for young men without homes, after work hours were past, except the ever abounding gin palaces. In a large city nearer us there is a magnificent Y. M. C. A. building, near the Catholic Cathedral. The bishop, no doubt with wisdom, has warned young Catholics to withdraw from this very un-Catholic and often anti-Catholic roof, where they found reading rooms, baths, gymnasiums, free classes; which things—though that city is in large majority Catholic—they could not find any Catholic institution to give them. Now, do we not almost tempt God—if the words be not a violence here—when thus we neglect to give, what youth rightly or wrongly demands, places of recreation, and under the guidance of the clergy—indirectly so at least?

Are we not much too indifferent to these things towards bridging over the gap between the saloon as recreation and the Church as the working place of the soul? I mean, is a man who occupies himself with fairly serious books, who has the companions that libraries and reading rooms make known to him, or who has his bathing and his billiards, his boxing, fencing and cards among fairly decent friends, where drink and dirt, and brutishness and scoffing are hidden or for-

gotten ; is such a man not more likely to love religion, the Catholic religion, appealing, as Cardinal Newman said, especially to the poetry in a man, or, rather, finding the poetry, the quieter and more tender virtues, just those which his religion loves to put before him, and in which she would have him dwell? Is such a man not better able to follow history, to understand the true relations of Church and State, to enter into the spirit of the liturgy, to form high ideals of conduct, leading to the ideal of the greatest, towards which all things may work together by our coöperation, Him indeed in whom we live and move and have our being? And can we not hope that such a one will in general help and not hinder the work of the Church and of its ministers, rather than the one who by ignorance, by idleness, by folly, if not by vice, lives during the week in a world so violently contrasted with the high and holy realm of Sunday that it is no marvel if he enters this last stripped of the needful wedding garment? There is *some* justification—is there not?—for what a charitable Protestant lady said, and not unkindly, to another Protestant, that while the Catholic young women had the religious life for those who were most full of care for their neighbor, yet those among them who would not think of being nuns were less given to good works, were more worldly and frivolous than many of their Protestant sisters of the world. And these last who are serious are too large a class to be compared with the Catholics who have religious vocations.

Readers of "The People of Our Parish" must have noticed how the Catholics of English-speaking America seem so greatly tormented with all difficulties arising out of social classes and surroundings. Certainly more Christianity of certain old world types would lessen worldly fuss and envy.

We speak hard words against French Catholics sometimes, because they seem to allow themselves to be tyrannized over and insulted ; and no doubt Archbishop Ireland has numbers of the French clergy who value his advice to meet this wicked world in the gate. But, says the academician, Paul Bourget, *you* speak these words, you who have your reserved pews, up to which you rustle among the crowded poor, who are almost your footstool, you who have no American missionaries, while the French Catholics have two-thirds of our missionaries in the world, you who give so few sons and daughters to Our Lord's "perfect" state, whose congregations know—as compared with us in France—nothing of the Church's ceremonies, nothing of her music, of her holy seasons, of her offices, and who seem to have little opportunity given you of joining your voices in her worship of God. Yet all this—robbed from your fathers it may be—is all in her mind inspired of God ; and if we have it not, we

are so far weaker Catholics, and should be learners, not carpers, not judges.

Praise to the French Catholics, said the English Benedictine, Father Burge, for that they have preserved the Church's music. Praise now to the Germans for their recent driving away of the silly or the theatrical music forbidden by God's voice in His service. But in America, if in these things we improve, yet it is not the English-speaking Catholics who improve most. However, I will say that the only time I heard "Yankee Doodle"—quick—in church was in a French Canadian church during the offertory.

We talk much of converts, but let us not scandalize them.

The other day an American Catholic paper had a word as to the model church choir of the world—in Glasgow—and why? Because the members of the choir, coming in, knelt down, the men on one side, the women on the other; nor did they talk all through the sermon; nor did they salute friends below in the aisle. And we think that a model. It shows to what we have sunk. And yet we hope to impress Protestants by the worship of God's Church, "performed" indeed—in a bad sense—in surroundings the opposite of those. Such a choir and ritual as is seen in the Paulists' church in New York, that is the common form to which Anglicans are now accustomed; as far as they can give true dignity to their remains of the Catholic offices, the which they eke out indeed with the words and forms of the Church thrown away by those beginners of sad Anglicanism of whose very High-churchism Heine said that it was "Catholicism without its poetry." But their choirs, habited in cassocks and cottas or surplices, form in their vestries and a (Catholic) collect is sung and responded to. They walk in procession through the church, the people standing; they kneel in their stalls, and the people and they pray, if they will, in silence. That is all good old Catholicism, is it not? Alas! as a convert organist said lately, when I think of all that beauty and orderliness, and "contrast it with the screaming and scrambling in the organ loft of this Catholic Cathedral." And he went on: "Whatever is Catholic seems to me to imply here everything that is horrible." He might have said for horrible "un-Catholic." For is not irreverence un-Catholic; and is it not a glory of the Church to speak of her art, her music, her use of God's natural gifts in her worship of Him? And is it "Catholic" now to have frivolous music, hideous painted windows, repulsive-faced statues and architecture in wretched contrast to that of some of the sects, to whom yet we appeal to come and admire the Beauty of Holiness?

This is taking things by the worst side; but it is a side. After fearful music we have heard the preacher speaking thereof as offering God our best—if only it had been anything like that—and in a

church little worthy (not of the congregation, as some now say, still less of Almighty God, as piety used to say) have we not heard that it reflects credit on everybody connected therewith?

It was a Protestant that wrote—about Catholic buildings—not of to-day:

“They dreamt not of a perishable home
Who thus could build. Be mine in hours of fear
Or grovelling thought, to seek a refuge here;
Or through the aisles of Westminster to roam,
Where bubble bursts, or folly’s dancing foam
Melts, if it cross the threshold.”

Trust in self, we all know, is a basis of morals. Yet Emerson’s “Trust thyself; every heart vibrates to that iron string” is Emerson’s, and may therefore naturally have an un-Christian undertone. In America we have surely needed individualism, and even perhaps self-complacency. But if there is any country in the world that can profit by “the great school of reverence,” as the Protestant Guizot called the Catholic Church, surely it is this one. Were it not for the Catholic Church in America, where would modesty be seen raised to humility, or courtesy to reverence? We have a great inheritance. Do not let us cast it away when now even those without are envying us who have it. And yet the very trust in self, in the country and the present, must make us fear, even though there be cause for rejoicing. There is amongst some of us a strange and monstrously anti-Christian murmuring that what is American is right, or must surely be so; a tyranny it is, none the less dangerous because we call the despot the State or the Republic, and not the Emperor. Hobbes’ crusher of real liberty, his lord over body soul, was the “Leviathan,” with crozier as well with sword, which might be the sign of republic, of oligarchy or of King, if only the soul were not free under its sway. Christianity came to smite Cæsarism, to give the true freedom; not the freedom to think wrong or to do wrong, but to assert one’s right to be at one with the absolute, with truth, with God. Christianity undermined the Empire; that saying has truth in it. St. Paul was loyal indeed to the State, but not in Cæsar’s sense. The Catholics were most of them loyal under Queen Elizabeth, but not to the giving up of the Faith, what the State claimed. Does it not require all the wisdom of the Church, all the good sense of her rulers, all the tact they can put forth to guide us in this our atmosphere of subservience to what indeed even Emerson called “the inconceivable levity of local opinion?” Perhaps he would not be offended were we to apply his words to a whole country. And so *we*, at any rate, can apply them—we who are the heirs of the ages, the inheritors of the full truth, the citizens of the Church in the world, the children of a divided duty; which yet is indeed but one single duty, if in all things we take care lest we judge of the greater by the less.

Catholics first, Americans after ; as in England one of the household of faith said, Catholics first, Englishmen after ; which a Protestant ecclesiastic—the present Bishop of London—lately reversed the order for his religion and country. How absurd to do any such thing. As Bryce says in his *Holy Roman Empire*, Christianity from the first, and so in the ninth century, and so in the nineteenth, has rejected the notion of a national religion as an essential absurdity, and the negation of the supernatural. Bishop Creighton's words imply the non-existence of Christianity, would men observingly distil them out.

Our own eyes of the mind, may they not be favorably opened by public deeds here of late as well as elsewhere? Not in this world is our place of rest. Nor is a country a lawful idol to any patriot. That cosmopolitanism of the Church, Lecky says, what an advantage it gives her people in their education, her priests especially. But let us try to use our advantages better, and in those things that we now have ventured to consider. Let us remember that "the Saxons may live again to God," that if not in Ireland, yet in other English-speaking lands we Irish Catholics have our great and never sufficiently thought of responsibilities, with the possibly more wondrous future ; that if France be lost to Christianity—of which there is little sign—Germany may be saved ; that "our ancestors are our ancestors, and we are the people of to-day"—of every day, indeed, not bound into petty doubts and fears. What have we to do with misjudging any, with closing hearts of suspicion against any who are seeking the truth, or being led they know not how into that city where men still dwell with their imperfections, but yet at whose centre shines the fulness of that light which enlighteneth *every man* that cometh into this world?

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

Frederickton, N. B.

MICROBES AND MEDICINE.

IN our age of great scientific achievements it is an extremely curious chance that has turned up the very smallest of living things as the most interesting subject for human investigation. There is no scientific question that attracts more widespread attention at the beginning of the new century than the relations of microbes to disease. All of these microbes, little living things as they are, according to their derivation from the Greek *μικρὸν βίον* are far beyond the limits of vision of the unaided human eye. Some of them that are now being studied for the first time are even beyond the powers of our best microscopes. Yet the ways and works of these minute creatures are at the present moment a topic of the liveliest interest to more of the human race than any other set of beings in creation except man himself. This is surely a case of extremes meeting and finding their affinities in their very differences.

The history of the science of microbiology, as that of all the physical sciences, reads almost more like a romance than the presumed prosy narrative of hard won scientific advance. The surprises as to the nature of the little beings who have proved to our broadening views to do much more for our weal than our woe are a perpetual reminder of the inexhaustible variety and teeming energy of the nature around us. Far beyond what preceding generations have considered the uttermost limits of celestial space new worlds and planetary systems, we might almost say universes, have been revealed to us by the improvement of the telescope and the patient study of astronomers. Points of light on the confines of space have proven to be suns around which doubtless revolve an attendant train of planets hidden as yet, but some time to be revealed. Just as far below the limits of ordinary human vision a new world has been laid bare by the microscope. The labors of the bacteriologist have taught us that law rules as inexorably in this universe of minutiae as it does in the great astronomical world. The littlest of the little influence one another as inevitably as do the mighty masses out where abyss calls to abyss. And everywhere there are the unmistakable signs of order that requires intelligence for its evolution and maintenance.

Microbiology has helped biology in its study of the relations of living beings of all orders. The wide application of the principles that rule the living functions of the smallest beings give an added interest to their study far beyond the practical importance of their

casual activity in human disease. At the present moment, then, there is an intense scientific as well as popular interest in microbes and their ways.

ORIGINS IN MICROBIOLOGY.

Almost as far back as the memory of man goes there existed at least a vague idea that contagious disease was due to minute living beings. A *contagium vivum* was assumed by all the old laws with regard to sanitation. It was understood that where dirt was allowed to accumulate and contaminated water to stagnate, there matter dangerous to health took on a new virulence. That this was due to vital reproduction and multiplication was at least implicitly understood. Every now and then down the centuries such an idea was explicitly expressed by some more thoughtful seeker into the causes of things. Some of the old pagan philosophers in the days when philosophy was proud to be thought *scientia causarum rerum* were sufficiently interested in physical truth to suspect at least that the cause of disease might prove to be living germs. Some of them hint at the existence of living beings so small that they could not be seen by the human eye. These expressions of opinion were apparently shrewd guesses at truth, anchors cast to windward in the shift-current of human knowledge, in the vague hope that they might find some rock of fundamental fact to cling to rather than serious scientific opinions.

It was well understood very soon after the physical sciences began to develop in modern times that the minute size of the living causes of disease kept them out of human vision, and as the microscope was undreamt of it was, of course, thought that they would never be a subject for exact human knowledge.

The first man to see microbes seems to have been the Jesuit Father Athanasius Kircher, the founder of the Kircher Museum, in Rome. Notwithstanding the most varied interests in history, the classics and archæology, Father Kircher found some time to devote to the physical sciences. In 1671 he reported the finding of "minute living worms" in putrid milk, cheese, vinegar, etc. He did not follow up his researches in this matter because minute investigation of any serious nature was practically impossible. The secret of the compound microscope was as yet undiscovered.

Lœwenhoek, in 1675, was the first to use a combination of lenses that gave sufficient magnification to enable him to see what we would now call bacteria. He called them *animalculæ*, that is, little animals, principally because of their spontaneous motility. He has left sketches of what he saw that enable us to recognize his *animalculæ* as what we now call *spirilla*—spiral bacteria. After a time:

Loëwenhoek suffered from scruples as to the religious tendencies of his work. As these little living things had never been seen by human eyes before, he argued that it was the evident intention of the Creator to keep them concealed from men. To him it seemed flying in the face of Providence to continue his investigations, and so the initial steps in microbiology were left for another century.

Some very acute forecasts as to the nature of the living contagion that caused infectious disease were hazarded from time to time by thinkers whose ideas were far ahead of their times. Robert Boyle, the father of chemistry, for instance, dared to formulate a prophecy that is very striking because of its literal fulfilment centuries afterwards. "He that thoroughly understands the nature of ferments and fermentations," said Boyle, "shall probably be much better able than he that ignores them to give a fair account of divers phenomena of certain diseases (as well fevers as others) which will perhaps be never properly understood without an insight into the doctrine of fermentations." It was the study of fermentations about the middle of the present century that led to the development of the parasitic theory of disease. It was the great discoverer in the realm of ferments, Pasteur, himself another chemist like Boyle, who was to do the ground-breaking work in medical bacteriology and furnish a sure basis of fact for the science of the etiology of disease, the department of medicine which up to that time had always been most nebulous and unsatisfactory.

THE FIRST DISEASE GERM.

The preliminary discovery in medical microbiology was made, however, before Pasteur entered the field. In 1850 Drs. Rayer and Davaine, as the result of an investigation of the nature of splenic fever, announced that: "In the blood of animals stricken with the disease little thread-like bodies about twice the length of a red blood corpuscle are to be seen. These little bodies exhibit no spontaneous motion." This is the first accurate and assured observation of what we now know as bacteria.

Rayer and Davaine attached very little importance to their observation, and it attracted practically no attention from the scientific world at the time. Splenic fever, thanks to a great extent to the discovery of its microbic cause, has ceased to be the scourge it was at the time Rayer and Davaine were so acutely studying it. About the middle of this century flocks were frequently decimated by it. It raged in all the European countries with great virulence. In Russia, known as the Siberian plague, it often caused fearful destruction among the cattle of the steppes. In Egypt something of the

estimation in which it was held can be gathered from the fact that it was connected by tradition with one of the ten plagues of Moses. In France there were years between 1840 and 1850 when splenic fever caused losses of from fifteen to twenty millions of francs (\$3,000,000. to \$4,000,000). In 1852 a special commission appointed for the purpose showed that the disease existed not only among horned cattle, but that certain fatal affections in other domestic animals which had been masquerading under other names were really special types of splenic fever. Sheep, for instance, and horses were promptly infected by injections of material from cows suffering from splenic fever. The disease ran a slightly different course to that in the cow, but it was quite as surely fatal. The disease occasionally attacks man himself. It is not unknown in this country even at the present time. It occurs especially among those who have to handle the hides and hair of animals that have died from the disease. The name by which it is familiarly known (wool sorter's disease) is due to this fact. It is also called malignant pustule because the primary symptom of the affection is a pustule that develops at the point where the inoculation of the virus took place. This pustule is usually very red and angry looking, and these characters have suggested the name by which it is commonly known—anthrax, *i. e.*, a glowing coal. The anthrax bacillus produces very virulent poisons during its growth in the tissues. These are absorbed into the system and cause high fever, prostration and finally exhaustion and death.

Despite the importance of the disease no further advance was made in the knowledge of its cause for over twelve years. During the last five of these years Pasteur described the various ferments and showed that fermentation instead of being a series of chemical reactions was a complex but easily intelligible biological process. In 1863 Davaine realized the importance his chance observation made in 1850 might have in explaining the cause of anthrax. Pasteur demonstrated that butyric fermentation, that is, the putrefactive process that gives to certain organic fatty products the odor and taste of rancid butter, was due to a micro-organism that possessed the characteristics of vibrios or bacteria. This recalled to Davaine the thread-like bodies that he had seen in the blood of sheep suffering from anthrax twelve years before. If filiform bodies could produce in a liquid the series of changes we know as fermentation, why might not analogous micro-organisms produce such changes in the blood of an animal as would lead to the systemic symptoms of anthrax?

He procured some blood from an animal suffering from splenic fever and inoculated it into healthy animals. They always suc-

cumbed to the disease. The blood of the dead animals always contained the filaments he had described years before; that of the animals experimented upon never showed them before the inoculation was made. For some time after the injection of material from infected animals no filaments could be seen in the blood of the animal experimented on, and so long as they did not make their appearance the blood of this animal remained uninfected when inoculated into other animals. Apparently the cause of the disease was these little filaments. For years a heated discussion was carried on over the question whether these filaments were a result of degenerative changes in the blood of diseased animals or a true casual factor in the disease. After the anthrax bacteria could be obtained in pure cultures on artificial media and after many generations of this kind of growth would still produce the disease all objections fell to the ground.

While anthrax is not important or widespread, two very significant advances in our knowledge of disease and its spread have come from the study of the anthrax bacillus. Mammals whose blood is about the same temperature as that of man take the disease very readily. The meat eating mammals, especially those whose temperatures are higher than that of man, do not readily take the disease. Birds whose temperature is very much higher than man's (about 6 to 8 degrees) and reptiles whose temperature is much lower are very refractory to the disease. If live fowls be cooled in a refrigerator until their blood comes down to about human temperature they become susceptible to anthrax and perish if inoculated with anthrax bacilli. On the other hand, cold-blooded animals like snakes become susceptible to the disease if they are kept for a time in a chamber warm enough to bring the temperature of their bodies up to man's.

It is evident, then, that susceptibility to anthrax is not a matter of animal peculiarity, but rather of bacterial virulence. Anthrax bacilli grow with fully developed powers only at a very limited range of temperature between about 96 and 100 degrees F. Above and below this temperature they do not acquire their full disease producing properties. This question of susceptibility is most interesting and important. Anthrax furnished the first definite information on the subject and gave the first hint as to the reason for the localization of such diseases as malaria and yellow fever.

The study of anthrax led to one other important discovery. The disease was found to develop every year in certain pastures. For a time it proved a very difficult matter to explain this peculiarity of the disease. It seemed to come to a complete stop for the time in a certain flock, and then seemed to originate *de novo*. These observa-

tions apparently contradicted the theory that disease was always a continuation of a preceding infection and never a new entity. Microscopic study showed that under conditions adverse to its continued growth certain appearances became noticeable in the bodies of the bacilli. Some portions of the little organisms took stains quite differently to other parts and refracted light quite differently. It was found that microbes in which these differentiated portions occurred were much harder to destroy than others. Besides it was found that they resisted drying for long periods. They did not continue their multiplication, but seemed to be in a resting stage. It was as if, like the larger annual plants, at the approach of unfavorable weather they had cast their seeds and trusted to them to continue the species. The little rounded bodies that could be seen in the bacilli then received the name of spores (*i. e.*, seeds), and it was set down as established that all microbes that produced spores were resistant to bactericidal methods. This discovery accounted for the preservation of many forms of bacteria in the intervals between epidemics of the diseases which they occasion.

A further interesting discovery came when it was found that if animals susceptible to anthrax were set to graze in a meadow beneath which the carcasses of animals dead from anthrax had been buried they were liable to contract the disease. Pasteur showed that if the graves of sheep dead from anthrax were surrounded by a fence and but a portion of the flock allowed to graze above the dead animals only these sheep contracted anthrax. Those grazing in the same meadow, but kept at some distance from the anthrax dead bodies did not contract the disease. Pasteur then showed that the earthworms in the earth above the infected bodies contained the germs of anthrax and that they often carried them from considerable distances beneath the surface of the soil. It has since been shown that anthrax bacilli in the spore stage may occur in the earthworms above the bodies of animals that have died from anthrax for many months and even several years after the burial of the bodies. This was the first great advance in our modern knowledge of the distribution of disease. Contagious diseases we know now are practically always carried by living agents. The elements wind and water, formerly thought so instrumental in the spread of disease, very seldom convey contagion, wind practically never.

THE MOST IMPORTANT BACILLUS.

For the human race undoubtedly the most important bacillus is that which causes tuberculosis. About one in eight of those that die are carried off by the growth of this little plant in their tissues.

Many of them are in the prime of life. Not a few of them were but a year or two before in blooming health. All of them have had high hopes dashed to the ground because at a given moment they became the chosen habitat of a little specimen of the plant family which asserts and maintains its rights to live and increase and multiply despite the havoc it makes with the well laid plans of mice and men.

It had been suspected by certain medical men for some years before Koch's discovery of the tubercle bacillus that tuberculosis in its manifold forms might be due to a specific germ or microbe. It had even been hinted by some that tuberculosis might be contagious. How rare such ideas were in the great body of the medical profession can be best understood from the almost universal protest that greeted Koch's announcement in 1882 that he had isolated the bacillus which causes tuberculous processes. The older and more experienced as a rule the practitioner, the more profound was his incredulity as to the value of the trumpeted discovery.

Needless to say, Koch's investigations have been substantiated by almost innumerable observers during these last eighteen years. Medical writers recall now that over 100 years ago the impression gained currency in Naples, where tuberculosis was raging with special fury, that the disease was contagious. It was even suggested at that time that the contagium was of such a character that it could be contracted from living in houses in which tuberculous, especially pulmonary consumptive, patients had lived—that it might, in a word, cling to the walls of living rooms or exist in corridors. This theory obtained such a hold on the Neapolitans that certain supposedly infected houses in which many patients had died from tuberculosis were burned. This was followed by an amelioration in the city's health, but whether this improvement was due to the better sanitary conditions after the fire or to the actual burning of so much contagious material, who could say?

The medical profession as a body clung to the idea of heredity as the great cause of consumption. When successive members of families constantly fell victims to it, father and son, mother and daughter, brothers and sisters, what else could be thought? Yet the seemingly necessary inference, as many another apparently of as absolute a character, proved utterly groundless. Members of the same family died not because of a common heredity, but because of contact with one another (for contact and contagion are from a common root), and because they lived in a tainted atmosphere.

Koch showed that there existed in the sputum of consumptives a little rod shaped microbe which when inoculated into susceptible animals produces lesions exactly like those that occur in human

beings suffering from tuberculosis. This discovery made the German bacteriologist famous; first, because of the important nature of the information it conveyed on a subject so vital to the human race, and second, because of the difficulties that had to be overcome in making the discovery. The tubercle bacillus grows very well in human beings and in most animals, but it was no easy matter to entice it into growing on a non-living medium. The little plant has what may be called social instincts. It is essentially parasitic in nature—that is, it prefers, according to the etymology of *πασιτρος*, to take its food along with some other living being or at least at the expense of the other being. It proved no easy task to find some food material that would tempt the tubercle bacillus to lower its dignity of parasite to man and the higher animals and become merely a saprophyte, that is, a plant that draws its nourishment from decaying material. Koch after a long series of experiments found that the cultivated taste of the bacillus could be satisfied with blood serum. It would grow on this medium, however, only when it was kept for weeks continuously at the temperature of the human body. If the temperature was allowed to drop below this then the bacilli failed to grow. If by accident the temperature went much above body temperature then failure was also inevitable. The main adjuvant to Koch's success was a rather unsightly looking oven-like apparatus arranged to be heated directly by a coal fire and kept at animal heat by complicated checks and counter checks and the care of the master and his assistants. This oven was very different from the perfect brood ovens we now have, in which by means of gas heat and a self-regulating gauge the temperature can be kept absolutely at blood heat without a moment's thought or care for months. The original old oven, however, in which Koch was first successful in obtaining growths of the tubercle bacillus is one of the curiosities of the Government Sanitary Museum in Berlin. Far more than the original steam engine it represents a great step in advance for the human race. It will be to future generations the symbol of a movement that has done more for man's happiness than any other in the history of the race.

Since Koch's time we have learned that tuberculosis is contagious, though not virulently so. Something more than one-seventh of the human race constantly suffer from the disease, yet the rest remain free. Most people are thoroughly resistant to invasion. The Germans have a saying that we are all really a little tuberculous, but this must be taken in a certain limited sense. In about 75 per cent. of all bodies that come to the autopsy table for causes other than tuberculosis, some tuberculous nodules are nevertheless found in the tissues. Loomis showed that the bronchial glands of many bodies

presenting perfectly healthy lungs contained living and virulent tubercle bacilli. For successful invasion of an organism by the tubercle bacillus something else is necessary besides its mere presence in the tissues. Only in patients who are predisposed to the disease will the tubercle bacillus grow and flourish. When we come to discuss the bacillus of diphtheria we shall find that individual predisposition is important for the development of diphtheria also. Virulent diphtheria bacilli may live in a healthy throat without producing diphtheria. This old idea of a predisposition to disease being a necessary element in the causation of disease is becoming more and more prominent the more we learn of microbes. Long ago its value as a factor in disease was recognized, but the reason was not known. The reason of it is coming out now from a source that promised originally to make predisposition to disease a myth.

In what the predisposition to tuberculosis consists we do not know. We know that it runs in certain families. We know also that it may develop in almost any one, however resistant to disease invasion ordinarily, who permits himself to run down in health, and especially in weight. The life insurance companies who have examined into this matter very carefully, because it is their business, prefer to take a risk on the life of an individual who has a tuberculous history on both sides of the family, but is himself in good health and of normal weight than to insure the life of a person without tuberculous heredity, but who is much under the average weight he should have for his stature. One feature of the predisposition to tuberculosis can be realized by the case of those who suffer from diabetes. These people have a superabundance of sugar in their blood and are very liable to be attacked by tuberculosis. Diabetic patients are now carefully segregated from those suffering from tuberculosis in our hospitals. Curiously enough, tubercle bacilli outside the human body grow better on blood serum to which a little sugar has been added. On the other hand, it has been noted that diabetic patients seldom suffer from ordinary pneumonia, and bacteriologists point out that the addition of sugar to a culture medium always makes it an unfavorable soil for the growth of the pneumococcus, the microbe to which pneumonia is due.

This points to the fact that changes in the blood may make very serious differences in susceptibility to all disease, and especially to tuberculosis. Not long ago the tubercle bacillus was analyzed and was found to be composed more than one-half of fatty material. Naturally a single bacillus was not employed in the analysis, but many of them grown together and the mass submitted to chemical assay. For its luxuriant growth, then, it has been argued that the tubercle bacillus requires the presence of free fatty material. This

is supplied to it in the ordinary culture media by the glycerine, which is added to all media intended for the cultivation of the tubercle bacilli because it stimulates their growth. It is at times especially, when individuals are losing weight, when the system is taking up the fat formerly deposited in the tissues and using it for the ordinary processes of life, that free fat is abundant in the circulation in the form most suitable for use by the tubercle bacillus. It is at these times that tuberculosis is always contracted.

SOME BACILLI RELATIVES.

About twenty-five years a disease well known in cattle under the name of "big jaw," because of the enlargement of the soft and bony tissues of the jaws which it occasioned, was found to be due to the presence of a form of bacterium hitherto undescribed. This microbe grew branchingly and its filaments proceeded more or less regularly from a common centre. This radiate structure suggested the name actinomyces, or ray fungus, from the Greek *ακτίνος*, ray, and *μύκος*, fungus. Ordinary bacteria are known scientifically as schizomycetes, *i. e.*, fission fungi (from *σχιζεω*, to divide), because they multiply by dividing into two, and these two continue the division and propagation is carried on. Actinomycosis took on a new interest in 1885, when it was found to affect man as well as the animals. Its lesions had often been noted in human beings, but owing to a certain similarity between them and the lesions caused by tuberculosis their true significance had been missed. In man the main focus of the disease is often in the lungs. In these organs the similarity of actinomycosis to tubercular consumption may be very striking. Infection may take place into a carious tooth, with spread of the process to the jaw as in animals. The ray fungus which causes the disease seems to find a favorite dwelling place on grains and grasses. Portions of grain, seeds or spicules of their stems are often found at the original site of invasion of the disease. In countries where actinomycosis exists the inhabitants are warned against the habit so common among country people of drawing straws or the stems of grasses through the teeth. The disease is rare and would not deserve a mention in a review of human bacteriology but for certain recent discoveries.

The radiate form which the actinomyces assumes in growing was thought for many years to be peculiar to itself alone. In examining sections of tissue that had been obtained from a leper, however, it was found that the leprosy bacillus which had been discovered by Hansen in Norway and described as a simple rod-shaped microbe of about the size and form of the tubercle bacillus some-

times grew also in radiate fashion. Further investigation only confirmed this observation, and showed that wherever the leprous process was especially acute and the tissues in which the bacillus grew were succulent, supplying abundant nutritive material, the bacillus of leprosy grew very similarly to the ray fungus. Then careful observation of the bacillus tuberculosis showed that this microbe often grew in branching forms instead of as a simple rod or bacillus. Babes showed that when injected into the meninges of small animals the tubercle bacillus often grew in a radiate form. Other investigators have confirmed these observations, and now it is generally conceded that the tubercle bacillus bears some very close relationship to the bacillus of leprosy and the ray fungus which causes "big jaw" or "lumpy jaw" in animals.

It is a curious fact that these diseases had been grouped together by pathologists long before the relationship between their microbic causes was even suspected. All of them produce changes in the tissues that are, when examined under the microscope, found to be very similar. The inflammatory reaction which infection with any of these diseases occasions causes the appearance at the site of inoculation of three forms of cells—round cells, epithelioid cells and giant cells. This characteristic succession of cellular appearances does not occur with other infections. The diseases are similar also in other respects. All of them are contagious, yet not intensely invasive. Tuberculosis is not contracted by a single chance contact with some sufferer from consumption, but by intimate intercourse for months or at least weeks with individuals suffering from tuberculosis.

Tubercle bacilli occur in many places and are breathed in without producing consumption. They have even been found in the mouth of perfectly healthy individuals. Leprosy, though its traditional reputation with the public would seem to class it as one of the most contagious of diseases, is in reality but very slightly contagious. There is not a case on record in medical literature of leprosy having been contracted by contact with lepers except where intimate association with the sufferers had been the rule of life for at least ten years. There are cases where leprosy was acquired apart from any hereditary taint, though at Constantinople a school of clinicians exists experienced in the treatment of lepers, who insist even now that heredity is the prime factor in the causation of the disease. Finally, actinomycosis, the other disease whose specific microbe resembles the germs of tuberculosis and leprosy, is only very slightly contagious. It is hard to produce the disease by direct inoculation. Only when the actinomyces or ray fungus is retained for long periods in contact with the tissues, as when a seed of infected grain

finds its way into a carious tooth or when an infected piece of grass or grain is carried by aspiration into the lungs, does the disease develop.

The question that occupies many minds in bacteriology at the present moment is: Are these germs of disease essentially distinct one from the other, or are they accidental modifications from some common stock? If the latter supposition is true, is it possible that by reversion one should reassume the disease-producing qualities of the other? As it is, while these little plants present certain striking similarities of form and of disease-producing power, they are no more nearly related to one another than are the apple and the pear or the lemon and the orange. We never hope to gather lemons from orange trees, and there is no more probability of finding that a lepra bacillus has given or will give birth to a tubercle bacillus.

MICROBIC TYPES IN ANIMALS.

Affections resembling very much in their course and symptoms the various tubercular affections in man have been noted in a number of mammals and in birds. There is a widespread belief that wild animals are comparatively free from disease. Their lives are known to end as tragedies, in the words of a recent sympathetic biographer, but it is not considered that they are liable to wasting disease. As a matter of fact, animals even in their wild state suffer from a number of diseases. Many of them fall victims to tuberculosis. Even the lions found dead along the edge of the great desert of Sahara, the perfectly dry air of which might be expected to prove a safeguard for them, present in many cases evidence of tubercular lesions. Most animals that die in captivity perish from tuberculosis. This is especially true for monkeys, for all animals from the tropics kept in our climate—though the polar bear is also a frequent victim—and for birds. The question of the identity of these diseases with human tuberculosis is important because of the opportunities for infection provided by intercourse with these animals and by the fact that their flesh is used as food. In cattle, for instance, the usual form of tuberculosis, "pearly disease," does not resemble the human form of tuberculosis, but other symptoms of the disease bear marked analogies to those observed in human beings. The bacilli of bovine tuberculosis are not so virulent for certain susceptible small animals as is the bacillus of human tuberculosis. On the other hand, the bacilli obtained from human sputum usually fail to produce true tuberculosis when inoculated into cattle. An inflammatory reaction is produced around the point of inoculation, but the disease does not spread.

Tuberculosis in birds seems to bear a very close resemblance to the form of the disease that occurs in mammals. That it is quite different, however, is proved by the fact that the bacilli found in tubercular lesions in birds are quite innocuous for mammals, while those obtained from mammals are equally harmless for birds. The temperature of birds is some five or six degrees higher than that of mammals, and this is known to protect birds from certain diseases caused by microbes whose favorite temperature is that of the human body. We have already mentioned how chickens fail to take anthrax so long as their temperature remains normal, but acquire the disease if exposed to it after their temperature has been artificially lowered by cold. The tubercle bacilli become modified by living at the unusual temperature, and so lose their virulence for animals of slightly colder blood.

For many years conservative bacteriologists insisted that the bacilli of avian tuberculosis were essentially distinct from those which caused tuberculosis in human beings and other mammals. It is only within this last year that the identity of these two forms of bacilli has been demonstrated. The method by which it was done was very ingenious. Cultures of tubercle bacilli from human sputum were enclosed in little sacs made of collodion. These sacs allow fluids to penetrate to their interior, and so permit the constant regeneration of the nutrient material on which the bacilli grow. They also allow the bacterial products to escape, for after awhile bacteria would become choked in growth by the presence of their own excrementitious materials. The collodion envelope, however, does not permit the egress of the bacteria nor the ingress of certain wandering cells in the animal body, the white blood cells, which would englobe, *i. e.*, swallow and digest the bacteria. When these little collodion sacs are placed in the peritoneal cavities of fowls, the microbes contained in them continue to increase and multiply for a long time. At the end of several months the bacilli of human tuberculosis begin to take on resemblances to the bacilli of fowl tuberculosis. According to Nocard, who is working in the veterinary department of the Pasteur institute just outside of Paris, at the end of nine months the human tubercle bacilli became transformed completely into the avian variety, which has been heretofore considered absolutely distinct. Human tubercle bacilli cultivated this way will produce the characteristic lesions of avian tuberculosis in birds. How rapidly such transformations of one bacillary variety into another may be effected under favorable circumstances is not yet known. The fact of the essential identity of these bacillary forms indicates the dangers there may be in animal contact.

THE BEST KNOWN BACILLUS.

The bacillus about which we know most for all medical purposes is the one which causes diphtheria. This disease has been generally recognized as distinct from other throat affections only for about eighty years. Bretonneau described the clinical course of diphtheria very accurately about 1821, and to him we owe the name diphtheria—from the Greek *διψθερα*, a membrane, because of the membrane that forms over the mucous surface of the throat in patients attacked. Some Spanish physicians seem to have recognized the distinct character of the disease about the beginning of the century, but their work received so little notoriety that it is only of late years that the rest of the medical world has known of their prior successful investigations. Diphtheria as a disease, however, can be traced back for thousands of years. Aretæus' description of certain throat affections leaves little room for doubt that he had seen typical cases of diphtheria. What Galen calls the chironian ulcer was a throat affection with a pseudomembrane on the mucous surface, sometimes of the pharynx—that is, the tonsils and upper throat, and sometimes on the larynx. There are even historical traditions of the existence of the disease much farther back than this. The Greeks believed it had come to them from Egypt.

In modern times it is easy to find traces of the disease in recent centuries. During the year 1557 there seems to have been a very generalized epidemic of diphtheria throughout Europe. Many deaths occurred in Germany, France, Northern Italy, Holland and Spain. A little more than a century later there is more than a suspicion of the occurrence of the disease in America. Samuel Danforth, a Pilgrim descendant, lost four of his eleven children—(Pilgrim descendants' families were larger in those days than at present)—in the course of two weeks from a throat affection described as a "malady of the bladders of the windpipe." The term bladder can scarcely mean anything else than the pseudomembrane portions of which had been coughed up during the course of the disease. About twenty years ago Klebs found a special form of bacillus in the throat of patients suffering from diphtheria. Shortly after Lœffler showed that his bacillus very probably stood in a causal relation to the disease. Since then we have learned much about the so-called Klebs-Lœffler bacillus, but instead of solving all the obscure problems connected with the microbe, difficulties have multiplied at each new discovery in the microbiology of the bacillus.

For instance, we know now that the diphtheria bacillus may assume very different forms, according to the culture medium on which it is grown. Usually it has the appearance of a rather plump

red, which takes staining material irregularly and so gives the impression of containing granules in its substance. But the bacillus may assume very different forms to this. It may have a bulbous enlargement at one end and so present the so-called club-shape. It may have bulbs at both ends—the dumb-bell form. Slender types of the bacilli may occur especially in the membranes from diphtheritic throats, and these are prone to be curved. Even branching forms of the bacilli have been noted.

The questions very naturally arise are all these forms equally virulent? are they all derived from an essentially identical family? It would seem that these questions must be answered in the affirmative. We know of the existence of a group of bacilli resembling the diphtheria bacilli in all ordinary particulars except that they do not produce diphtheritic symptoms in animals. Whether this pseudo-diphtheria bacillus is, as some authorities think, only a degenerate form of the true diphtheria bacillus, which has for the moment lost its virulence, remains to be determined by future investigation. The picture presented by a bacillus under the microscope cannot be a criterion of its nature. Many bacilli resemble each other very much. They are plants, and if it is remembered how difficult it would be to distinguish many plants from each other if we had only a distant view of them, it will not be hard to realize that mere external form is not and cannot be used as a final standard for differentiating bacteria. The virulence of bacilli—that is, their power to produce a certain disease—has been considered an ultimate criterion, but even this is not absolute. Disease depends on susceptibility as well as infection—that is, it is not enough merely to have the germ of a disease present to produce that disease; the animal experimented with must be liable to the disease and must at the moment be in a state which it is not specially resistive to the invasion of the specific microbe.

A number of observers have shown that the true diphtheria bacillus virulent for animals may occur in the throats of perfectly healthy individuals. It may also occur in affections of the throat that bear no resemblance to diphtheria. It is even claimed that it is because of its liability to be carried around thus by people who are either, to all appearances, perfectly well or who seem to be suffering only from mild throat trouble that the diphtheria bacillus continues to be distributed widely and to cause frequent outbreaks of the disease where no diphtheria existed before. A form of bacillus very like that described by Loeffler occurs almost constantly on the conjunctiva or mucous membrane of the eyes of normal individuals. When diphtheria does attack the eyes, as happens sometimes in nurses and doctors, because material from a diphtheritic throat is

coughed into them, the affection is always very severe. Is it possible, then, that one of the diphtheria bacillus family has a habitat on the conjunctiva, just as the pneumococcus, the cause of pneumonia, is constantly present in the mouth, yet without producing symptoms?

Why speak of the diphtheria bacillus, then, as the best known bacillus? Because the tracing of its microbiology has helped to throw light on many of the important questions that concern susceptibility and immunity to disease. The study of this bacillus has especially brought out the fact that was being lost sight of in the enthusiastic search for specific germs for every contagious disease that the absence of individual resistance to disease constitutes at least as important an element in the causation of disease as does the virulence of the bacilli. Besides, it is practically for diphtheria bacilli alone that certain other important questions as to the nature of bacilli and their products have been answered. The toxine, that is the poison produced by the bacillus, the absorption of which causes the fever and prostration incident to diphtheria, has been carefully studied. Its surprising power for evil even in extremely minute quantities has been demonstrated. In this respect any of the ordinary poisons we know, strychnine or atropine, or even aconitine, do not compare with it. The amount of pure diphtheria toxine that will produce serious symptoms in an animal is almost inappreciably small, probably less than one billionth of the body weight.

More than this, however, bacteriologists have learned something of nature's method in neutralizing this very virulent poison in the human system and have succeeded in finding a means to help her in the process of neutralization. When diphtheria patients recover there is manufactured in their systems a substance which combines with the toxine of diphtheria and renders it harmless. This substance is called an antitoxine. It was found that when animals were inoculated with very small quantities of diphtheria bacilli they readily recovered from the symptoms produced. If inoculated again with the same amount they recovered even more readily. Something evidently had been left in the system which helped them to overcome the virulence of the diphtheria bacilli. If now they were inoculated with larger and larger doses they finally reached a condition in which they were able to withstand many times what would have been a fatal dose of diphtheria bacilli before the series of inoculations was begun. It was found further that if some of the blood of animals whose ability to resist diphtheria bacilli had been thus deliberately developed was injected into other animals at the time when these animals received inoculations of diphtheria bacilli,

they suffered less from the effects of the inoculation and recovered sooner. This is the principle on which diphtheria antitoxine is manufactured.

In practice a large animal such as the horse, who is at once naturally very resistant to diphtheria and is able to furnish large quantities of blood serum, is taken. The animal is inoculated with diphtheria bacilli and after the fever and prostration which ensue have subsided another inoculation, and after a similar interval another is given. Each time the strength of the inoculation is increased. In this way the antitoxic value of the animal's blood serum becomes very great. When one-tenth of a cubic centimetre of horse serum is able to protect an average sized guinea pig against ten times the ordinary fatal dose of diphtheria bacilli the serum is said to be normally antitoxic. One cubic centimetre of such a serum is designated as one antitoxic unit. The serum can be made much more strongly antitoxic than this, so that one cubic centimetre may represent hundreds of antitoxic units. It is considered an advantage to have the antitoxine value of the serum very high, for then it is not necessary to inject a large quantity of the foreign serum into diphtheria patients to secure the desired results. For ordinary cases of diphtheria from 1,000 to 3,000 antitoxic units are employed, according to the virulence of the affection. Whenever the disease extends into the nose the larger doses are given, because in the succulent tissues of the nose the bacilli grow rapidly, and besides absorption goes on more readily from here than from other parts of the upper respiratory tract. Whenever the larynx is affected, that is whenever the mucous membrane covering the vocal chords is invaded by the disease, larger doses, even to 5,000 or 6,000 antitoxic units, are given. The formation of the false membrane that is characteristic of diphtheria in this region soon closes up the chink of the glottis, the narrow opening between the vocal chords for breathing purposes, and the little patient is liable to asphyxia for want of air.

Many complaints have been made of the harmfulness of antitoxine. There is not a single case on record where it ever caused death. Children sometimes die suddenly. If the sudden death occurs shortly after an injection of antitoxine straightway the death is attributed to this. All the reported deaths have been due to other causes. Antitoxine does not affect the kidneys. On the contrary, the renal affection which so often occurs with diphtheria subsides after the administration of antitoxine is begun. How little danger there is in the remedy may be seen from the fact that while 5,000 units is usually the largest dose given, in very severe cases, recently from 60,000 to 80,000 antitoxic units have been given in three days,

with reported good results. Certain inconveniences have been noted as occurring after the administration of the remedy. Skin eruptions resembling hives have been reported, occasionally joint swellings occur. These conditions are never serious, however, and the symptoms disappear after a very short time.

The successful introduction of antitoxine represents the first great triumph in the field of bacteriological therapeutics. The death rate from diphtheria has been lessened to a wonderful degree. Statistics from all over the world seem to show that while the death rate from diphtheria in various epidemics before the introduction of antitoxine was about 30 per cent., the death rate now is under 12 per cent. The impressions of medical men who treated many cases of diphtheria before and after antitoxine days show that the confidence in the new remedy is not merely a result of the conviction forced upon them by statistics of cases, but is due to their own personal experience, showing them that the course of diphtheria under antitoxine is quite different to what it was under other modes of treatment. The expression of the superior of a large orphan asylum in one of our principal cities is very striking in this regard. "Before antitoxine came," she said, "when an epidemic of diphtheria occurred we knew that it would spread widely and that more than one-half those attacked would die. Now we know that the spread of the disease will be limited and only a small percentage of the cases prove fatal."

THE SMALLEST MICROBE.

About three years ago Professor Loeffler, one of the original discoverers of the diphtheria bacillus, described some of the negative characters of the smallest microbe so far investigated. He was studying foot and mouth disease, an affection prevalent among animals in certain countries, and which may exceptionally attack man. It was found that a very small portion of the diseased tissue of an infected animal sufficed to produce the disease when inoculated into another animal. The most careful search, however, failed to reveal any traces of microbes in the tissues or in the secretions from the lesions. When inoculations were made from the infected tissues in bouillon, a favorite culture medium on which many kinds of bacteria grow luxuriantly, no change took place in the appearance of the bouillon. Usually the meat solution employed in such observations grows turbid after inoculation and a flocculent scum forms over it as a result of the growth of the microbes. Despite the fact that the bouillon remained to all appearances unchanged, it was found to have acquired the property of conveying foot and mouth disease to animals into which it was injected. This virulence remained inherent in the liquid even after filtration through a Pasteur filter.

As the unglazed porcelain of this form of filter never fails to detain all ordinary bacteria, this latest microbe must be much smaller than any micro-organism hitherto studied.

The most painstaking scrutiny in the examination of the bouillon cultures of the microbe under the highest powers of the microscope fails to reveal the presence of anything having the appearance of a bacterium. That some microbe is present is evident from the fact that the bouillon after inoculation becomes progressively more virulent in its effects. If injected before inoculation with material from lesions of foot and mouth disease it fails to produce any effect; if injected shortly after the introduction of the infectious material it is but slightly if at all virulent. After some days, however, it has all the virulence of material taken directly from an animal suffering with the disease.

Humboldt in his demonstration of the theory of the microscope showed that the minimum visible would be of the diameter 1-125,000 of an inch. When objects are smaller than this in size diffraction takes place around their edges and the shattering of the waves of light precludes vision. The ideal microscope has not been made as yet, so that the limit of microscopic vision has not reached the theoretic minimum visible. The ordinary small microbe, such as the staphylococcus, measures from 1-30,000 of an inch to 1-20,000 of an inch in diameter. This new germ is probably not more than 1-100,000 of an inch in any dimension. The vista of possibilities for life in infinitesimally minute particles opened up by this discovery seems almost endless. If portions of matter so small as to be beyond the range of our microscopes cannot only support independent life, but enable that life to exhibit such distinctive properties as characterize all other bacteria, the field of microbiology promises to be as prolific in ever widening limits and new subjects for study as the science of astronomy. In the almost infinitely great and the infinitesimally little, analogous advance will open up new worlds.

MIXED INFECTIONS.

Because one microbe has gained a foothold in the animal economy is no reason why others should not also enter. Microbes of different families are not at all exclusive. On the contrary, most of them are very sociable and invite others in as soon as they find themselves not unwelcome. The weakening effect of one microbe serves to make it easier for others to gain entrance. In a number of diseases it is the secondary infectious agents that often prove of most significance in what regards the course of the case. In tuberculosis, for instance, especially of the lungs, the tissues whose vitality has

been seriously impaired by the tubercle bacilli fall an easy victim to other microbes. It is these secondary invaders that cause most of the disintegration of tissue in pulmonary consumption and give rise to the fever and night sweats, at least of the early stages of the disease. It is well known that the tubercle bacillus when alone very seldom causes any acute symptoms. A tubercular abscess in a joint may remain latent for a long time. It gives so few inflammatory symptoms as a rule that it is the custom to talk of this form of abscess as a cold abscess. Almost invariably, however, as soon as a cold tubercular abscess is opened up symptoms of hectic fever are noticed. Other microbes have got in through the incision and their toxins produce acute symptoms.

In diphtheria the secondary or mixed infections are almost more important than the diphtheria bacilli. It is the presence of these secondary infective agents that hinders the efficacy of diphtheria antitoxine in certain cases. The antitoxine serves only to neutralize the specific toxins produced by the diphtheria bacillus. The remedy has not the slightest modifying effect on the toxins of other bacilli that may be in the system. Simple diphtheria, unless malignant from the beginning, is not in our day, thanks to antitoxine, difficult to treat successfully, but diphtheria complicated by secondary infections still remains an insoluble therapeutic mystery.

VIRULENCE OF DRIED BACILLI.

One of the most interesting phases of recent bacteriological investigations has been the demonstration that bacilli retain all their virulence for long periods in spite of the fact that they have absolutely been deprived of all moisture. Typhoid bacilli have been kept for over two years in a drying chamber whence every trace of moisture was removed by means of chemicals, yet when inoculated into culture media it promptly proceeded to grow once more and had all its former virulence. Strings are dipped into liquid cultures containing bacilli and then hung up to dry. Even after over 100 days of this absolute drying process the bacteria are not killed, but only rendered comatose. This faculty of retaining life under these circumstances is very interesting from the biological standpoint. Usually when deprivation of water is brought about living protoplasm dies. The continuance of life among the bacteria shows that they can under unfavorable circumstances enter upon a seed or spore stage, during which, in the absence of moisture, though there is no multiplication, the vital potency remains ready to manifest itself as soon as suitable conditions become re-established.

This property of retaining life and virulence in the dried state is

extremely important because of the liability of microbes to be blown around in the shape of dust. Undoubtedly many microbes are thus widely distributed. Wind-borne epidemics of disease are, however, very rare. Once this was thought the principal way by which disease was propagated. There are, however, too many enemies to the microbe in nature to permit of their continued existence for long. Of these the most destructive foe is sunlight.

SUNLIGHT AS A BACTERICIDE.

Sunlight is the great germicide. Exposure of any microbe to full sunlight for a few hours suffices to bring on its almost inevitable destruction. Virulent tubercle bacilli especially are sensitive to the germicidal action of sunlight. Diphtheria bacilli rapidly lose their virulence when exposed for but a short time to the direct rays of the sun. In a hospital ward it has been found that the shutting out of the sunlight by close curtains predisposed to relapses of the disease. The manner in which sunlight effects microbes has been studied very carefully. We know, for instance, that it is especially the blue end of the spectrum that causes the destruction of microbes. Exposure to red or dark orange light has practically no deleterious effect upon microbe vitality. Red has even a favorable influence on some microbes. On the other hand, there are certain rays of light, for light they must be called, though they do not produce any impression of color upon our eyes, which are even more strongly germicidal in their action than are even the violet rays. These rays have been the subject of a great deal of study long before their special action on microbic life was recognized. They are known as the ultra violet or actinic rays. It is due to a large extent to their chemical activity that photography owes its success. They are capable of breaking up the silver salts and so produce photographic effects.

The explanation usually suggested for this mysterious action is that the wave lengths of these ultra violet rays of light bear some intimate relation to the wave lengths of the atoms of matter in the silver salts. This relation is such that wave interferences result and the constituents of the silver salts fly apart until compounds result, the excursions of whose atoms will not be interfered with by the waves of light. This same actinic power is supposed to force the atoms of bacteria from their combinations in the living protoplasm of the bacterial cells with the production of new chemical compounds incompatible with life. As a recent biological writer has put it somewhat poetically: "The sunbeams invite the bacteria to a dance in the glancing sunlight. The invitation cannot be refused.

For the microbes it is the dance of death. They literally dance themselves to pieces, and the millions of little tragedies can be seen accomplishing themselves all unsuspectedly in any stray beam of sunlight that wanders across our rooms."

The practical side of the question of sunlight as a bactericide is extremely important. It is after a succession of damp, sunless days that such diseases as influenza, pneumonia, rheumatism and that many featured disease, the "common cold," are especially prone to occur. Living and working in rooms to which the sun is unable to penetrate especially predisposes to their development. If the high building mania should continue life in large cities will become still more unhealthy than it is. In narrow streets the ten to twenty-story buildings, when they occur opposite one another, effectually preclude the entrance of nature's great scavenger—the silent, pervasive sunlight. The comparative mortality of city and country favors the country mainly for this reason. The difference threatens to become even more marked than it is. While the average of human life in large cities is scarcely more than thirty years, in the country it is nearer thirty-seven.

Nature has provided a most effective safeguard against a preponderance of microbic life, but man seems almost with malice prepense to set about the undoing of it. Living rooms when they have ample opportunity for sunlight are often kept constantly dark from week's to week's end by curtains and hangings. The shades of carpets and upholstery and the housewife's complexion must be protected from the deteriorating and revealing influence of strong sunlight. Fashion dictates the use of stained glass windows for staircase and corridor. Usually the yellow and red shades predominate. These colors absorb all the most efficient light rays and let pass only those that are but feebly germicidal. It is in corridor and staircase especially that the full play of bright sunlight should be encouraged. Here are brought direct from the street by those who enter all the microbes that are about. Here, too, the dust with its microbic contents is blown in and settles to be disturbed at every entrance and exit from the house.

THE TOXINES OF BACTERIA.

A great deal is heard of the toxines of bacteria in our day, and the question naturally arises, what are they? Bacteriology has not as yet fully answered this question, but much has been learned with regard to it in recent years. Every plant that grows contains some characteristic chemical substance which may be separated from other substances in the plant by suitable analytic methods. Sometimes

there is more than one characteristic substance. The vendor of proprietary medicines often vauntingly proclaims that his remedies are perfectly harmless because they are purely vegetable in origin. As a matter of fact, however, our most virulent poisons in medicine do not come from the mineral, but from the vegetable kingdom. Strychnine, the active principle of the Ignatia bean, and atropine, the alkaloidal principle of night-shade, are familiar examples. A still more powerful poison, aconitine, also vegetable in origin, is gaining wide notoriety at the hands of novelists and the daily newspaper. It is not a matter for surprise then that microbic plants also secrete intensely poisonous compounds.

When the investigation of bacterial toxins was first begun it was thought that they were alkaloids, just as strychnine, morphine, etc., are. Further investigation, however, shows that they are probably albumoses. This class of substance is a modification of ordinary albumin, but may be intensely poisonous. A poison recently investigated resembles the toxins of the more virulent bacteria quite closely. It is probably one of the last substances that would be thought of in this connection. Snake poison would be considered to belong to quite a different class of compounds. It is, however, like the bacterial toxins, an albumose. Albumoses are nearly all (there is a large series of them) distinctly poisonous. They occur at a certain stage of normal indigestion, and if anything hinders the digestion of food beyond this stage they may be absorbed into the system with the production of what is known as autotoxemia, that is, self-poisoning. It is the absorption of these incompletely digested substances that gives rise to the depression so often noticed in sufferers from indigestion. Fortunately the albumoses produced and absorbed during the course of disturbed digestion are never very toxic.

Many bacteria produce only mildly virulent albumoses, but some varieties, as the bacillus of anthrax, the tetanus bacillus, and, according to recent researches, the bacillus of tuberculosis, manufacture toxic albumoses of extreme intensity. Other vegetable poisons, as, for instance, morphine and strychnine, are feeble in comparison with these microbic toxins. The dose of any of these alkaloidal poisons required to kill, though usually not more than a grain or two, is simply enormous when compared to the minute quantities of microbic toxins that may prove fatal. The pure concentrated poisonous substances have been subjected to rigorous investigation of late years. Large quantities of microbes have been grown on favorable culture media and the toxins produced have been isolated from all merely adventitious material and carefully studied. The results obtained are almost appalling. Amounts of

material representing much less than 1-100,000,000 of the body weight of an animal may produce serious, possibly fatal, symptoms. As in the case of the microbes beyond the range of the microscope we are here dealing with problems whose main factors are beyond valuation by any of the crude scientific methods that we as yet possess.

Curiously enough there is a condition that develops in the human body itself without the intervention of microbes the symptoms of which bear many analogies with poisoning by microbic albumoses. This is sunstroke. Under the influence of long continued elevation of temperature, where there is no period of rest to allow for repair of the intricate mechanism of bodily metabolism (for it is after sleepless nights that sunstroke always comes) the system loses control of its chemical energies and a series of compounds are manufactured that act as intensely virulent poisons especially on the nerve tissues. This problem is as yet, however, too unsettled for discussion here.

PRESENT FOCUS OF BACTERIOLOGICAL ATTENTION.

A bacillus that has received great popular and scientific attention this last year or two is the bacillus of bubonic plague. This little plant seems to have been the special instrument of Providence on a number of occasions in the world's history for clearing the stage of undesirable elements and making human life simpler. As the evolutionist might put it, a renewed virulence of the bacillus pestis bubonicæ has been an important factor in the course of evolution for the removal of the weaker individuals in races whose degeneracy made the prospect of further development problematical. The plague or pest bacillus has been a substantial element in the rigid application of the great purifying principle of the survival of the fittest. There are traces of plague at least four centuries before Christ. The pestilence that overwhelmed Athens in Thucydides' time, carrying off nearly one-half the inhabitants, may not have been the bubonic plague. The Greek word that is used to designate it, *γοιμὸς*, may mean any epidemic disease, and Thucydides, a most acute observer, gives no hint of the occurrence of the glandular swellings so characteristic of the disease and from which it derives its name, "bubonic." There are sure traces of the disease in the fourth century B. C. It seems probable that the disease has existed from the very earliest times.

Within these last few years it has been found that there are three locations where bubonic plague is endemic, that is, where cases of the disease continue to occur in the intervals between great epidemics. These three nurseries of the undesir-

able plant leveler are situate, one in the neighborhood of Mecca, in Arabia; one at the foot of the Himalaya Mountains, in India, and the other on the shores of Lake Victoria Nyanza, in Africa, near the head waters of the Nile. It is from these three persistent foci of the disease that the great epidemics have taken their rise. The continued existence of plague in some part of India has long been suspected. Many of the great historical epidemics took their rise there. The fact that pilgrims from Mecca spread the disease not infrequently has been surmised at least for a century or more. It is only in our own times that measures have been taken for the enforcement of such sanitary measures as would ensure reasonable safety from the disease from this quarter. Even now, however, absolute assurance is not attainable. A number of the smaller epidemics in Asia Minor have been traced to this source. Only three years ago Professor Koch while on an expedition for the German Government in German East Africa discovered the existence of the plague focus on Lake Victoria Nyanza. From there certain hitherto inexplicable epidemics along the Nile and on the Barbary coast have had their origin.

The tracing of the sources of infection substantiates very well the position assumed by all bacteriologists that infection never originates *de novo*, but is always transmitted continuously through various media. A disease that has persisted for a long while in a neighborhood may become less virulent for the inhabitants of that neighborhood, yet may possess great virulence for people living under other conditions, people protected neither by heredity nor by the living conditions which may have rendered a special microbe comparatively innocuous. An epidemic, then, is a transplanting of the bacterial plant to soil where it flourishes with unwonted vigor. Such things are not unusual in zoölogy and botany. Rabbits introduced into Australia for purposes of sport became a national pest by the wonderful reproductivity they developed under the new conditions. The Scotch thistle introduced by some fervidly patriotic Scotchman became an intolerable nuisance demanding government aid for its limitation—eradication was out of the question. In the history of epidemics it is well known that a hitherto unattacked tribe or race may be practically wiped out by some simple contagious disease, certain cases of which are constantly present in civilized communities. Measles, for instance, always caused great mortality among our American Indians whenever it secured a foothold among them. Small-pox, next to fire water, has been the most fatal gift of civilization to our red brother.

Every now and then some bacillus finds a favorable soil in a new people, and then we have an epidemic. Often this epidemic does

not break out with all its virulence at once. It seems to acquire virulence by becoming accustomed to a people and their living conditions, and after passage through a number of susceptible individuals it acquires an infective power which enables it to affect those who were able to resist it at the beginning of its career in a particular place. This mode of action seems to be particularly characteristic of plague or pest bacilli. Usually a few scattered cases of the disease occur in a country. At first it does not spread beyond those in immediate contact with patients first affected. Then there is a subsidence of virulence that lulls into inactivity the startled efforts to root out the disease. Sporadic cases occur for some time, and then there is a sudden lighting up of epidemic virulence.

We have not had a serious epidemic of plague in civilized countries since the beginning of the last century. About five years ago in India the affection began to spread epidemically. Despite all the assurances given by Indian sanitary authorities that it could be effectively controlled, plague has continued to exist ever since on the Indian peninsula in epidemic form. It spread thence to various parts of China. Then it scattered itself along the commercial routes from India. It invaded Mauritius; it reached Manila. The world was startled by hearing of its occurrence in Alexandria last year. A few months later came the news that plague had succeeded in gaining a foothold in Europe at Oporto. From here it crossed the ocean to several South American cities. Then it was heard of at Honolulu. The Australian cities began to suffer from its ravages. Finally it turned up in the Chinese quarter of San Francisco. In none of these localities are we sure that it has given up its hold. All this recalls the insidious way of the disease before a great epidemic, and there is serious question whether we may not be on the eve of such an event. Certainly the test of the efficacy of our vaunted sanitary measures for the prevention of disease is now at hand. The next year or two will decide whether our sanitary science is sufficient to protect us against one of the oldest and cruellest enemies of the race.

BACILLI AND EVOLUTION.

Microbiology has attained not a little of its interest for biologists because it exemplifies in their simplest expression a number of the great principles which underlie the life history of all living beings. Behring, the discoverer of diphtheria antitoxin, called attention some years ago to the fact that certain important questions in heredity and evolution might be best studied in bacteria. When a generation lasts a scant half hour and the scientist has the oppor-

tunity to study not a few, but millions of successive generations, and when he can submit these successive generations to the most varying influences by changes of nutrition, temperature, conditions of moisture and all the other elements that make up plant environment, it is to be expected that he will be able to elucidate many of the problems connected with environment and heredity. So far at least, however, such expectations have not been realized. Bacteria of one genus persist in that genus despite the changes of environment to which they may be subjected. At most certain unimportant modifications in their extrinsic qualities are acquired and the microbes invariably recur to their original form and properties when placed under favorable conditions.

The bacillus of bubonic plague, for instance, produced the characteristic symptoms of plague as we know it to-day some 2,400 years ago. Countless generations of the bacillus have come into existence since then, but each has had all the qualities of the pest family of bacilli. The bacillus was not discovered until our own day, but it has been faithfully propagating its species in active obscurity for some thousands of years. If there is an evolution in all living things we might surely expect to find plague quite a different disease to-day from what it was originally and conclude that the bacillus would have developed into quite another form.

Now the bacillus of plague has been doubling every hour or so, even allowing for long periods of quiescence, for quite 2,000 years at least. The number of generations reaches up into figures of which the human mind can form no conception. If the bacillus still remains the same as it was, it seems clear that while evolution may be possible there exist certain stages in development at which organisms become absolutely fixed and further progress does not take place. In the case of the bacteria it can scarcely be argued, as it is for the higher beings, that the few generations we know anything of are inadequate to form the basis of a judgment as to the influence of environment on living beings.

MICROBES THAT ARE NOT BACTERIA.

How little arguments from analogy amount to in the etiology of disease is rather strikingly shown by the history of the investigation into causes of malaria. Malaria is a febrile disease, infectious in nature with many resemblances to the other infectious fevers. The periodic fevers, with intervals in which there is no fever, recall certain infections after wounds and surgical operations when intermittent chills and fever occur. This periodic febrile course is also noted in consumption, in which there may be no rise of temperature in the morning and considerable fever in the afternoon. It might con-

fidently be expected then that malaria would be found to be due to some form of bacterium.

As a matter of fact several form of bacteria were described by Italian observers as occurring in malaria. Laveran's observations in Algiers, however, showed that the cause of malaria was of quite a different nature to bacteria. While the bacteria are vegetable or plant organisms that grow by division of individual elements, the malarial germ is of animal nature and requires periodic conjugation in order to go on with the process of multiplication. Of course the plasmodium malariae, as it was called originally, or the hæmatozoon Laverani, *i. e.*, the blood animal of Laveran, is very low in the animal scale. It is difficult to distinguish between plants and animals at this stage of development. The name protistæ has been suggested for these unicellular plants and animals that have so many characteristics in common that it seems needless refinement to separate them. Distinctions exist, however, and can be found on careful search.

The interesting feature of the malarial parasite is the recent discovery of the fact that a certain form of mosquito is its host as well as man. The theory of the mosquito borne origin of malaria had been suggested at various times for a century. We owe its enunciation in definite form, however, to the penetrating intuition of Dr. Patrick Manson, of the British Indian service. Before a single confirmatory observation had been made Manson elaborated the idea that the malarial parasite had as intermediate host in the course of its distribution from man to man the mosquito. After the event it seems hard to realize that some such theory was not formulated before Manson's time. Malaria is not contagious in the sense that it will spread from bed to bed in a hospital ward. It is essentially a disease of locality. It can be conveyed, however, as has been proved experimentally by the inoculation of blood from patients suffering from malaria into healthy individuals. The next step in the theory, the realization of the agency of the mosquito in the matter, seems inevitable. The mosquito in infected countries feeds on malarial patients and afterwards on those not suffering from the disease.

Manson's theory was soon substantiated by Ross' observations. Ross showed that the malarial parasites penetrated the stomach walls of the anopheles mosquito, multiplied, wandered into the salivary glands of the insect and then from there were inoculated into human beings at the time "the odious creature presents his bill." The life habits of the mosquito have now been carefully studied. They confirm Manson's theory and add weight to Ross' observations. The insect does not sting during the day, but preferably just at nightfall. As is well known in malarial countries,

this is the most dangerous time for the unacclimated to be abroad. The mosquito will not thrive at a temperature much below 70 degrees, so that malaria does not break out anew during the winter time and does not occur at all in cold climates. The mosquito requires stagnant water for breeding purposes, and so the neighborhood of swamps is very naturally a favorite haunt of malaria. Careful investigation for the last three years has not enabled ambitious and acute searchers to find a single locality where malaria exists and the anopheles mosquito is absent. By protecting themselves carefully against mosquitoes men have been able to live in the most malarial districts, in the Campagna at Rome, in the dreadfully malarial district around Albanella, southeast of Naples, which has had an evil reputation ever since early Roman times, and where the newcomer practically never failed to contract the disease in a virulent form.

The mosquito theory of malarial distribution has become the mosquito doctrine. Now that we know the cause of the disease it will not be difficult to prevent its spread. First the mosquitoes will be limited by the drainage of swamps and all stagnant water; second, all malarial patients will be protected from the approach of mosquitoes by netting and other precautions. If the mosquitoes do not become infected themselves, they cannot convey the infection. Malarial parasites do not originate *de novo* in the mosquito, but are generated only by their kind. Then, too, all malarial patients will be cured as soon as possible by the free use of quinine, which it is known kills the parasites in the human circulation and so limits the opportunities for the spread of the infection. Third, those who enter a malarial country will protect themselves by mosquito netting from the stings of the insects—this has been effectually done under trying circumstances—and so will not be inoculated with the malarial parasites.

The prevention of malaria and its eradication is probably the greatest blessing that could be conferred on the human race at the present time. Millions of acres of fertile land in the southern part of the temperate zone that now lie useless and barren, or are imperfectly cultivated because of the dangers of malaria, would be restored to man's use. Practically the only reason why the white race is unable to withstand living in the tropics is not the heat of the sun, but the danger from malaria. The eradication of the disease would open up the tropics to colonization and give unlimited opportunities for the spread of civilization in countries as yet in a state of barbarism.

THE NEW MICROBIOLOGY.

Even the slight discussion of these few headings from present-day microbiology that our space allows shows how broad are the

limits of the new science that has actually been born and reached its development in the last few years. Bacteriology is by no means the narrow study of disease germs that it is often considered to be. It is a most helpfully promising science for the race. Within it are to be found the principles on which the avoidance of disease must be effected. Already it has made the work of sanitation definite and taken its practice out of the realm of the merely empirical. Very few realize how much this is accomplishing in lengthening the average of human life. There are said to be alive in London to-day over one-half a million of people who would not be living if the death rate that prevailed fifteen years ago obtained up to the present time. The average length of a generation of the human race has not increased, but there are certain factors at work that would have made it even shorter than it is if sanitary bacteriology had not come in to prevent it. This is the time of great cities and great cities are wasters of life. It is where men are crowded together in large masses that death rates are high unless every precaution is taken. City death rates would be much higher even than they are but for bacteriological progress.

Besides this practical aspect the new microbiology is of interest because of its relation to other sciences. The study of toxine and antitoxine is bringing new light into the intricate mazes of organic chemistry. The changes produced in the various animal tissues by the presence of microbes and their toxins is making clearer some of the difficult problems of physiological chemistry. The cellular changes induced in various organs are teaching new details in physiology and helping us to understand mysteries in pathology. Something has been said of evolution and microbes, and there are other important questions of general biology on which light may be thrown by bacteriological investigations. The unicellular organisms represent life in its simplest form. All living things are aggregations of cells, so that the fundamental problems of life remain the same for all beings. The changes brought about by environment may be studied in their simplest expressions in these minute organisms. In a word, the new microbiology rules a microcosm whose laws are as interesting as those of the visible universe all around us. Every discovery made will have a significance beyond the limited sphere in which it is found. The despised microbe, abused of the quack and writer of funny paragraphs, may yet prove the key that will unlock hitherto incomprehensible mysteries in the realm of living beings.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York City.

SAINT ENNODIUS AND THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

GLOOMY and ill-boding were the auguries, poignant and desolating the scenes of grief amid which the year 500 was ushered in at the capital of the Christian world. Often before, no doubt, had the impious hands of ruthless persecutors placed a crown of sorrows on the fair brow of Christ's Church; but such cruelties and insults had mostly her avowed and detested enemies for their authors. Now she is wounded close to her very heart by professing friends, and the gaping rupture threatens her divinely-assured existence. A saintly and cultured Pontiff has been duly installed in the chair of St. Peter, and he is intensely loved by the great majority of his spiritual children. But that disrupting and paralyzing curse of Christendom, an Antipope, has fallen heavily, with all its pestiferous accompaniments, on the clergy and the people of the Sacred City, and has spread its abominations of intrigue, distrust, hatred and even murder everywhere, from the hallowed precincts of the churches and the renowned assembly of the Senate, to the lowest dens of infamy and the resorts of perjured slaves. Schism, in all conditions, is an evil of measureless mischief and malice; it saps the foundations of charity and makes wicked or deluded minds insensible to the ennobling influences of religion; it is an unnatural rebellion of selfish and stubborn children against a loving mother. Heaven stamps its progress with the unmistakable brand of reprobation, in the enormities that never fail to follow in its wake, and frequently visits its authors and fomentors with summary and shocking chastisement. But schism undisguised and foully aggressive, pacing the very sanctuaries and mounting the altar steps of the apostolic basilicas and threatening even to seize upon the Papal throne; schism, the outcome of an infamous bargain between the Eutychian Emperor Anastasius and the intriguing courtier Festus, to have the insidious and heretical Henotikon foisted on the acceptance of the bishops, priests and faithful by the purchased efforts of a pliable Pope; schism which bespattered the pavements of Rome with the blood of holy priests and devout laymen—such a schism, lasting for four years, was the direst culmination of all the indignities and terrors that the Church had yet been subjected to. True, even if the Almighty, in His inscrutable wisdom, had permitted the designing and unscrupulous pretender to establish himself in the chair of the Supreme Pontiff, Christ's promise would have still safeguarded the

See of Peter and the utterances of his successor against the contamination of heresy, however unworthy that successor might be of the exalted office and terrible responsibility thus recklessly undertaken. A signal example of such manifestly miraculous intervention of the divine power is presented in the somewhat analogous case of Vigilius, who is alleged to have secured the favor of the court of Constantinople by a nefarious compact with the Empress Theodora, to have received and dealt out enormous money bribes in order to gain support in his disreputable candidature for the Papacy, and to have been a guilty accomplice in the imprisonment and starvation of Pope Silverius. Yet from the first moment when he was recognized as Bishop of Rome and Supreme Pontiff all his pronouncements were rigidly orthodox, and his stand in defense of the true doctrine was staunch and fearless. But when the faith and the flock are threatened the pastors must recognize the stern necessity of obeying their Divine Master's command—*Vigilate*. The guardians of the priceless deposit of faith could not fold their arms and look idly on while a dastardly and corrupt combination was being organized to tamper with that heavenly treasure, to dislodge the divinely constituted Vicar of Christ, and to plant the false oracle of heresy in the chair of incorruptible truth. "The good shepherd giveth his life for his flock;" the wolves have entered into the sheepfold and must be expelled at any sacrifice. Nor is it bishops alone that are bound to defend the faith from injury and alloy. "He that will confess Me before men, him shall I confess before My Father who is in heaven" embraces every individual believing in Christ.

That the clouds of error and the storms of fierce conflict were soon put to flight, and that the spotless Spouse of the Redeemer emerged from the cruel ordeal with undiminished vigor and in all her pristine lustre, was the unfailing effect of the divine promise: "Behold I am with you all days even unto the consummation of the world." "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." To meet such terrific crises God Almighty ever raises up some indomitable defender of truth, some intrepid champion of the rights and discipline of our holy religion, who carries the standard of the true faith unsullied through the stormiest struggles until a sweeping and decided victory restores peace and gives a new impulse to the activity of the Church. In the overwhelming troubles that darkened the dawn of the sixth century the hero of the strife and the triumphant upholder of the Papal prerogatives was Ennodius, to whose enlightened and noble championship history has accorded but a tardy and inadequate acknowledgment. Thirteen centuries and a half had rolled by, from the death of this illustrious scholar and saint, before full and well merited promi-

nence, in the view of the whole Christian world for all time, was conceded to him by the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican. There his teaching and his theses on the supremacy of the Holy See received the highest conceivable sanction of infallible approval, and his name was bracketed with those of Leo the Great, Athanasius, Cyril, Gregory the Great, Avitus and, in modern times, Alphonsus Liguori as a brilliant defender of this revealed and no longer debatable truth. The learned Baronius is enthusiastic in his just praise of the author of the "Apologia:" "His words deserve to be engrossed in letters of gold on that dark page in the Church's history."

Pope Anastasius, in the year 498, deputed two cultured and trustworthy bishops to accompany to Constantinople Festus the Patriarch, who was proceeding to the imperial court on affairs of the State. These prelates were the bearers of an important Papal letter addressed to the Emperor and imploring him to dissociate himself from the partisans of the late patriarch, Acacius, who had gone to his final account under the anathema of the Church, and to return to that warm and pronounced allegiance to Christ's vicar which he had so constantly displayed before his accession to the throne. So far was the Emperor from permitting himself to be gained over to the cause of religion that he even succeeded in securing from Festus a solemn undertaking to use all his powerful influence, in the church and at court, to have the Henotikon adopted and approved by the Pope and the Western bishops. This Henotikon, it will be remembered, was a most seductive document, drawn up by Zeno at the dictation of Acacius, professedly in the interests of peace and union, but implicitly heretical, since it ignored the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon.

Before the return of Festus, however, Pope Anastasius had died, and already speculation was keen on the subject of a successor. Festus saw that if his unworthy projects and schemes were to have any chance of success it would be by the election of a Pope who would owe his elevation to his support and who would promise him to effectuate his engagements to the Emperor. On the 22d of November, 498, the Archdeacon Symmachus, a native of Sardinia, and attached to the Constantine Basilica or St. John of Lateran's, as it was afterwards called, was duly consecrated Pope in that church, having been elected, according to custom, by the vast majority of the clergy and people. But Festus had utilized with effect the short interval from his return, and in the words of Nicephorus quoted by Baronius, "he had corrupted a certain number of the clergy who gave their votes to Laurence, a Roman priest." Thus there were two consecrated, the deacon Symmachus, elected by the larger number (and already promoted to the priesthood), and Laurence, supported by

the minority. On the very same morning, while the true Vicar of Christ was receiving the episcopal ordination and Apostolic commission as Bishop of Rome and Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, the turbulent and corrupt schismatics were setting up a rock of scandal by the uncanonical and criminal consecration of the Antipope in the Basilica of St. Mary Major. Festus was in the zenith of his power; he had just delivered to Theodoric the Emperor's official letter under his great seal, recognizing his status as King of Italy. Though he had been already acknowledged as such by his own Ostrogoths and by the conquered Italians, this formal acknowledgment of his royal dignity by the Emperor of the East added a fresh lustre to his power and prestige, while it removed all fear of molestation. To Festus, as the trusted bearer of this important message, enhanced importance and increased influence naturally accrued, and he was not slow to improve the opportunity thus offered by representing that he was commissioned by the Emperor to endeavor to heal the religious differences that distracted the churches of the East, and to bring about a clear understanding and perfect harmony between the East and the West, Constantinople and the Holy See. Owing to the praiseworthy and urgent nature of the momentous task he professed his anxiety and power to achieve, he succeeded in deluding, by false pretences, many holy ecclesiastics; bribery was a more potent weapon to overcome the objections of the less upright.

The ecclesiastical histories deal with this critical conjuncture in the affairs of the Church in so confused and misleading a manner that it is only by a careful comparison of the Letters of Ennodius on the subject that we can arrive at a clear conception of the sequence of events. For instance, we are informed that the schism continued for four years, and in the next sentence or so it is stated that both sides in the prolonged dispute agreed to submit their jarring claims to the arbitration of Theodoric. Both these statements are undoubtedly accurate, but it was *immediately after the election* that the joint appeal was addressed to the King, praying him to intervene and promising cheerful submission to his judgment. The following are the words of the *Liber Pontificalis*: "After a long discussion the rival parties agreed that the two Pontiffs should go to Ravenna to submit their case to the judgment of the King, Theodoric. The equitable principle enunciated by the King was this: 'The Apostolic See belongs by right to him who was first ordained or who obtained the larger number of votes.' His opponents could not resist manifest facts, and it had to be admitted that Symmachus had received the majority of votes. He took possession of the chair of St. Peter." This obviously just decision did not, however, crush the revolt or

restore tranquillity. Open resistance was abandoned for dark conspiracy and squalid calumny.

All this took place during the winter of 498, and in March, 499, a council was convoked by order of Symmachus, under whose presidency as undisputed Head of the Church 72 bishops, 67 priests and 5 deacons assembled in St. Peter's Basilica. The decrees of this council are followed by the signatures, first, of the Supreme Pontiff: "I, Coelius Symmachus, Bishop of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, have subscribed these synodal decrees, approved and confirmed by *my authority*;" in the second place, by the bishops; and, thirdly, at the head of the list of *priests'* signatures, appears that of the Antipope: "I, Coelius Laurence, archpriest of the title of Saint Praxedes, have subscribed, with my full consent, these synodal decrees, and *I swear to remain faithful to them.*" We shall see how lightly this solemn oath sat on the conscience of the arch-disturber; but the direct aim of our narrative and the order of the salient facts demand that we should first briefly review the motives and manner of the advocacy of the Papal rights by Ennodius, whose historic oration was not the only testimony of his whole-hearted zeal. He threw himself into the contest from the very outset with a devotedness and perseverance that obstacles and dangers were powerless to shake or thwart.

Magnus Felix Ennodius was a native of Arles, where he first saw the light in 473. His family, like most of the nobility of France in those days, was connected with many illustrious houses of Rome and of other cities of the now fallen and dismembered Empire. While still very young he was taken to Milan by a rich aunt who resided there and by whose generosity his gifted mind received all the available advantages of a splendid education. If we accept as unexaggerated recitals of facts his somewhat startling accusations of himself in a work framed on the model of St. Augustine's Confessions, we can hardly regard his boyhood as a fit prelude to that after life of sanctity and self-sacrifice that has gained for him an honored place on the Calendar of Saints. He inherited his aunt's attenuated fortune, which was so notably augmented by the dowry he received with the lady he married while he was but a little over 16 years of age that he describes this latter accession to his material wealth as incomparably greater than what remained of his aunt's property and legacies. *Ex mendico in regem mutatus sum.* At 20 he was attacked by a malignant and lingering disease which was the turning point in his life. His wife entered warmly into his new views and showed her earnestness by embracing the religious life and entering a convent forthwith. Ennodius devoted himself with characteristic ardor to a thorough preparation for Holy Orders, and received deaconship at

the age of 21. Laurentius, Archbishop of Milan, then entrusted to him the supervision of the hospitals, the care of the poor of the city and the management and custody of the Cathedral revenues. In addition to these onerous and engrossing duties, he conducted a most successful school, mainly frequented by the youth of the aristocracy and including in its programme the humanities and the rudiments of the art of eloquence. He became Bishop of Pavia in 511, was twice employed as Papal Envoy to Constantinople and died in the prime of life in 520. His memory is honored by the Church on the 17th of July, the anniversary of his edifying death. Popes Nicholas the First and John the Eighth speak of him as the "great" and "glorious confessor."

To justify the character and to appreciate the value of Ennodius' well directed efforts in the early stages of this momentous contest between Pope Symmachus and his unscrupulous rival, it is necessary to consider the disorganized and venal condition to which civil and judicial administration had been reduced by the recent civil wars. Thierry assures us that the improbity of judges was so general that the vice had to be reckoned with in all important cases; and Ennodius himself, though in his profession of advocate at the public bar, which he followed for many years, he never accepted briefs in any but transparently just cases, often found what we may bluntly call bribery of the unfriendly judges a regrettable necessity. With this ungainly aspect of public morality we are not brought into immediate contact, fortunately, in this bitter and protracted struggle; but we can very easily infer from the spirit of venality that everywhere prevailed how necessary it was to have abundance of money at ready command to purchase the good offices of the needy courtiers at Ravenna in order to secure a satisfactory hearing from the King. When the ready cash at the disposal of Ennodius out of his own personal resources was exhausted by the enormous expenses of which we shall learn more as we proceed and on gratuities of the nature just indicated, his credit as the owner of immense property and of an honorable name was sufficient to cover as a guarantee of repayment all the advances that were needed.

The Pope, on the other hand, stood in a position of helpless penury, the chief sources of revenue to the Roman churches being in possession of his reckless adversaries. It is touchingly edifying, however, to observe from the statements of Ennodius that the Holy Father, in the midst of all his anxieties and the most pressing demands for money to meet expenses incurred on his personal account, never permitted to be touched the small but sacred reserve which he retained in inviolable trust for the deserving poor. Even now, after the lapse of 1,400 years, those energetic and withal graceful letters

of Ennodius to the Deacon Hormisdas, who afterwards filled with dignity and distinction the Papacy he was now defending against faction and fraud, and to the upright and scholarly Luminosus, who acted in the capacity of chancellor to the Pope, are replete with interest and instruction. At first blush a forcibly worded appeal to the Head of the Church to discharge money liabilities contracted on his behalf and with his knowledge suggests a scandalous laxity in a quarter where the whole world is to look for guidance in example as well as in word, especially in reference to admitted claims of justice. The writer very properly defends the urgency of his repeated applications on the ground that it is Laurence, the Bishop of Milan, that is pressing for repayment, and he even goes so far as to say that he is prepared to fully reimburse that prelate out of his own pocket if all else fail. We must remember that the abnormal exigencies of the Pope's hampered position amply warranted a delay; and, secondly, that the guarantor nowhere expresses a doubt as to the demands of justice being satisfied in the end. The amount of which there is question in the following instructive quotation from a letter to Hormisdas was due to Ennodius himself, but is not very urgently demanded back :

"Some short time ago, while we were overwhelmed with anxiety and were still uncertain of the favor of our pious King and in doubt as to the judgment he might pronounce on the accusations with which the Pope was charged, I handed over all my numerous camels to you to be given to His Holiness the Pope, with this stipulation, that if the animals themselves were not necessary (presumably for conveying the Papal equipage from Rome to Ravenna) their value should be realized and their price, as fairly estimated, be restored to me. Independently of this transaction, His Holiness is fully acquainted with the fact that, to the very best of my ability, I have on all occasions relieved, at your request, the pressing needs of our holy Roman Church. In return, kindly do me the favor of recalling to the memory of the Pope, just now, the facts of the negotiation I allude to. I would request you also respectfully to make known to me the result of your interview. I have every confidence that neither the Pontiff of the Apostolic See nor you who worthily discharge the office of intermediary can entertain on the question any other views or intentions than such as are in consonance with our stipulated agreement and with justice."

This modest and diffident epistle sheds a flood of light on the devotedness of our Saint to the Holy See; almost single-handed and at enormous risk he sacrificed his peace of mind, he expended all his money, mortgaged his vast estates, devoted his brilliant talents and staked his wide popularity and distinguished name in the disinter-

ested and weary work of defending the rights and liberty of the Supreme Pontiff. It is with a heavy heart and a keen sense of the cold ingratitude of the Pope's *entourage* for all his unsparing efforts and lavish expenditure in the sacred cause with which their sympathies and interests were so closely bound up that he pens the scathing but just reminder: "*Cui mos est pia jugiter facere, justa non despiciet, et qui largitur proprium aliena non subtrahet.*"

In a letter to Luminosus he further discloses to us, by a palpable and concrete illustration, the endless exertions he had made, and this statement he writes in no boastful or glory-seeking spirit, but from sheer compulsion: "Both through my communications and directly from the mouth of our revered Bishop of Milan himself you have been made aware that he claims the repayment to him of those sums that were expended at Ravenna in the interest of our Holy Father. This expenditure, absolutely necessary to meet the requirements of the case, exceeded in the aggregate 400 gold pieces, distributed in varying sums to influential personages whose names it would be impolitic and wrong to disclose. Now, these large amounts were advanced by my bishop, Lawrence, on my personal security; and I cannot reconcile myself to appearing in his presence with unabashed boldness until I shall have obtained, as I have every confidence I shall obtain, through your kind offices and mediation, a thorough fulfilment of the promises given. Should you think my claim either extravagant in itself or disrespectfully asserted, then I shall discharge out of my own resources every fraction that the revered bishop has been good enough to advance, and for the reimbursement of which I alone am bailman. I hold in my possession the Pope's letter, wherein he authorized all necessary expenses to be defrayed under my note of hand." It is consoling to reflect that, slender as were the revenues and impoverished the exchequer of the Holy See at this trying crisis, the principal at least and probably the interest, too, at the current rate had been duly discharged in the interval between the date of this last quoted letter and that of his application to be indemnified for the sale of his camels and for expenditures of his own money. But numerous were the messages and urgent the appeals on each of three occasions at least conveyed by a confidential courier, who was to bring back the coin, before the heavy debt was liquidated. In turn he invoked the aid of Luminosus, Hormisdas and the Deacon Dioscurus to give effect to his demand. To Luminosus he addresses language of piteous entreaty: "You promised that the repayment of these necessary expenses advanced by your request would be forthcoming without any avoidable delay; but, in punishment for my faults, some hidden destiny has always interposed an obstacle. The Bishop importunes me with

such urgent pressure that he scarcely allows me time to despatch a special messenger to the Holy City. After God, the matter is now in your hands."

The second projected visit of Symmachus to Ravenna to counteract the effect and to demonstrate the groundlessness of the filthy charges trumped up against him, as he had already appeared there with striking success to defend the validity of his election, must have taken place in the winter of 499, if the design was ever carried into execution. That ample means were provided for that express purpose we know, and that the ministers and courtiers at Ravenna were kept posted on the nature and extent of the foul means adopted by the partisans of the Antipope to compass their nefarious designs we likewise know. But we are not in possession of such explicit statements or precise data as would justify the assertion that the visit actually took place. Two important and undeniable facts point in the opposite direction; the appointment of a visiting bishop to investigate the charges in the beginning of the year 500 and the visit of the King himself in the September of the same year. The malcontents did journey to Ravenna to prefer their calumnious charges, and succeeded in carrying their point for the time. They convinced the King that they were proceeding according to the requirements of Canon Law and were easily able to adduce instances in which the Pope had himself appointed a visitor to take cognizance of charges alleged against bishops. What the Supreme Pontiff had put in force against others they argued he could not object to submit to himself. The King, being himself an Arian and only superficially acquainted with the constitution and ordinances of the Catholic Church, was in good faith convinced of the seeming reasonableness of their contention. Thus was the Roman Pontiff sought to be placed on the same level with other bishops, which was a direct and emphatic denial of the supremacy of the Holy See. All the unwearying vigilance and energetic precautions of Ennodius failed to prevent the tricky intriguers from snatching this far-reaching concession from the unsuspecting King. Had the case been presented with that lucidity and cogency of reasoning on behalf of the Pope that Ennodius displays in his *Apologia*, even a temporary triumph could not have been scored by his opponents thus, seemingly by chance. But *chance* is a pseudonym and a misleading one; it was by a wise and happy disposition of Providence, who can ever make passing evils the occasion of lasting good. It was to this event that the immortal "*Apologia*" owed its origin; and it was this event and its immediate consequences that opened the eyes of the bishops of the world to the glaring outrage of subjecting the recognized successor of St. Peter to such an indignity and injustice; and it was this

event that drew from Avitus and the other Bishops of Gaul their noble and memorable protest.

It is important to observe that there were as many as five councils summoned at Rome in connection with this calamitous struggle. The dates of the councils enable us to fix, with tolerable accuracy, the time and duration of most of the other incidents. We have seen that the first of the assemblies met on the 1st of March, 499. Of this council two canons are extant and incorporated in the legislation of the Church. They are both conversant with Papal elections, and enact the extreme penalties of deposition and excommunication against priests, deacons or inferior clergy who enter into cabals or adopt corrupt means to further the cause of any aspirant, and they seal with the Church's approval the wise principles followed by Theodoric in favor of the majority of votes. At the close of this council the too indulgent Pontiff canonically appointed the hypocritical Laurence to the bishopric of Nuceria; and we gather from Ennodius that, concealing his unsatisfied ambition and his dark designs, he departed from Rome and took possession of his see. It is pretty obvious that the new and execrable trick of endeavoring to oust the legitimate Pope by bringing against him vile, calumnious charges must have been started and worked with malignant persistency from the very moment of the Antipope's departure from the city. For Baronius and other reliable authorities prove to a demonstration that a second council, of which the acts have not been preserved, was held soon after Easter of 500, and that the visitor and Antipope were there deposed and excommunicated. It was, therefore, in the winter of 499 that, yielding to the entreaties of Faustus, Probinus and many other influential personages, the King approved of the nomination of Peter, Bishop of Altinum, to inquire into the alleged charges. The *Liber Pontificalis* has the following summary:

"Some intriguing clerics and certain Senators with Festus and Probinus at their head formulated an indictment against Symmachus and suborned false witnesses, whom they sent to Ravenna, there to make their depositions. In the meantime they secretly recalled Laurence and published throughout Rome the various articles of the impeachment. The schism was revived; some of the clergy adhered to the communion of Symmachus, others to that of Laurence. The Senators Faustus and Probinus addressed an appeal to the King and employed all their efforts to obtain from him that he would appoint a visitor to the Apostolic See. The King named Peter, Bishop of Altinum, for that office—a measure opposed to the canons."

The visitor was expressly directed in the commission given him by the King to report himself to the Pope directly on his arrival in

Rome, but instead of doing so he at once publicly identified himself with the party of revolt, forgetting his official character of impartial judge as well as his duty as a bishop in communion with the Holy See. "It was, undoubtedly," says Ennodius, "the King's explicit desire that the visitor should bring to Rome not dissension and discord, but harmony and peace. He clearly foresaw that if he did not fortify this unfortunate man with the most precise instructions for his guidance, the contagion of your envenomed artifices would soon make of him a corrupt supporter of faction. Because it is written: *The simple man believes in every word.* Consequently he defined for him a line of conduct and imposed upon him a solemn obligation not to deviate from it. These instructions directed the visitor to present himself at the Basilica of St. Peter's as soon as he would have reached the city of Rome. This was nothing more or less than to embody in a royal order the wishes of the Holy Father himself. Who, then, would have conceived for a moment that a bishop, even if the secular authorities had forbidden it, would have failed to conform to those pious rules and customs that the prince himself did not believe himself exempted from complying with? The visitor was bound to pay his respects to the Pope and to request him in a personal interview to deliver over his slaves; he was bound to give him an undertaking that the said slaves would not be put to the torture, but would be kept in safe custody to be heard by the council in the process of the investigation." These slaves belonged to the Pope's household, and were alleged by his accusers to be in possession of incriminating information. "From the very beginning of his mission this visitor was circumvented by intriguers and, so far from being a messenger of peace, was transformed into a brand of discord. Without so much as the formality of a visit to St. Peter's—*invisis beati Apostoli liminibus*—he gives himself up to be blindly conducted by the caprice of your fury; and that temple—the centre of strength and authority for all other churches—which attracts the faithful from all corners of the earth; that temple your visitor passes by close to its very porticoes, but condescends not to enter. He, a mere commissioner of investigation, is too grand to approach the supreme court of the Church. That branch severed from the stem left no room for hope, from that instant, that it would produce good fruit. You have refused to permit your visitor to avail of the privilege of approaching those hallowed precincts, filled as they are with ennobling memories, fearing that he might perchance detach himself from your crawling errors if he knelt in homage before that august sanctuary of St. Peter's *confession*. You cannot, therefore, screen yourselves behind the royal authority which you have flouted in its very first ordinance; already doomed objects

of the wrath of heaven, you have merited in addition the severest chastisement from the King, whose explicit directions you have maliciously infringed."

The reader cannot fail to observe with what prudent deftness the accomplished orator contrives to extol the foresight and fairness of Theodoric, while at the same time he proceeds to show, with characteristic force of argument, that the appointment of a visitor by the King or by any other authority, civil or religious, was directly opposed to the canons and to the most elementary laws of the constitution of the hierarchy. As has been already remarked, the existence of a visitor with power to bring the accusations against Pope Symmachus formally before a council or so-called high court supposed to possess jurisdiction over him was an explicit negation of the Papal supremacy. But while he heaps compliments upon the King with royal profusion, though with cultivated delicacy, he is much more eloquent in his tribute of eulogy to the tomb of the Apostles. In contrasting the conduct of the visitor with that of the millions of pilgrims that come from the ends of the earth to do reverence to the Vicar of Christ and to reinvigorate their faith and zeal on the spot where Saints Peter and Paul preached the true doctrine and sealed it with their blood, he proposes the objection: "Perhaps you will say it is doing an injury to the dignity and power of those denizens of heaven to imagine that their influence is confined to any one particular place on earth." And he proceeds: "Prayer, it is true, is heard, no matter in what part of the world it is offered; the faith and devotion of the suppliant make the martyr present by knowledge wherever he is invoked. But who will venture to deny that the saints are more deeply loved in the land of their birth, or that they are more tenderly revered and more confidently invoked on the spot where they sacrificed their lives to be received into God's everlasting presence? Our Redeemer, I admit, makes the entire world the theatre of His stupendous miracles, but the countless crowds of pilgrims that throng to this glorious monument have invested it with unrivaled honor and prestige. He who can change carnal man into an angel can assuredly endow with special blessings one particular corner of the earth."

We are still quoting from the sublime and immortal *Apologia*, and as this is the most appropriate place to examine the answer of Ennodius to the argument that secured from the King his approval of the uncanonical nomination of a visitor, we shall give the orator's own statements and reasoning, even at the risk of making the quotation rather lengthy. The momentous character of the question at issue and the unanswerable cogency of the reasons adduced are, it is hoped, a sufficient excuse.

"The Pope, they argue, assigns visitors in case of other bishops, and common justice requires that he should be himself bound by the law of which he is the author. Let us see if that proposition can be defended in canon law. Now, I have no wish to accuse them of wilfully contradicting the known truth; I will not directly denounce them as liars. I will content myself with affirming that the legislator is *not* subject to his own law; if the prince is not above the laws that he enacts for his subjects, it is vain to invoke his authority to have these laws executed." It is the same line of argument as that of St. Thomas. No man can be subject to himself; hence his enactments can only possess for him a *directive* force; the *punitive* and *coactive* elements are wanting. It is this directive force that Ennodius designates the law written in the heart or conscience. "There remains for him the law of his conscience, a law written in the hearts of all of us and which fails not to direct the man who is exempt from all other laws. Of his own uncoerced motion he embraces that virtue with which no fear of punishment imposes upon him compliance. *When there is question of others, God has willed that they should be judged by their fellow-men; but in regard to the Pontiff of the Holy See, He has reserved the judgment to Himself in the most absolute manner. Sedis istius præsulem suo sine quæstione reservavit arbitrio.* It is the Divine will that the successors of Saint Peter should be amenable to heaven alone, and that they should bring before the Supreme Judge a conscience that no earthly authority has had jurisdiction to examine. If they are guilty, imagine not that they are exempt from fear; their own conscience and the ever-present Deity, whom nothing can escape, are constant witnesses of all their actions." They can say with David, *Tibi soli peccavi.*

"But, you will object, every man is in this position; he has his conscience to accuse him when he goes wrong and God to condemn him if he perseveres in his guilt. My answer to this is brief and conclusive: It was only to *one* man and his successors that the Divine Redeemer said: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Quidquid solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cælis.* I will add that the verdict of the saints since the foundation of the Church proclaims the dignity of the Pontiffs of the Holy See as an object of veneration throughout Christendom, since the universal fold of Christ is subject to it and lovingly accepts its sweet yoke. This see is named the central and the chief see of the whole world, and to Rome may be applied the exclamation of the prophet Isaiah: "*If she is humbled, to whom will you have recourse? Where will you leave your glory?*"

These are some of the words that the learned Baronius very justly remarks "ought to be engraved in letters of gold," and our readers

will agree that their author deserves a more prominent place and higher praise than our historians have hitherto given him. A few of his hymns, especially the beautiful ode on the holy virgin Euphemia, are referred to with scant eulogy; we are informed that his Apologia was approved by the Pope and the Roman Synod and ordered to be inserted among the acts of the Council, and some of the unappreciative notices add that his style was labored and turgid: Thus is relegated to undeserved obscurity one of the most devoted sons of the Church since the days of the Apostles; an unselfish and powerful supporter of the Roman Pontiff by purse and pen, by material succor and by the gift of eloquence, in the hour of sore and trying necessity; a bright and shining light; a beacon on the hill-tops of the distant past as a signal of the Church's infallible security. His conclusions have been crystallized into unchangeable dogma by the Vatican Council. "*Si quis dixerit non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione seu jure Divino ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam ecclesiam habeat perpetuos successores; seu Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem: anathema sit.*" "*Si quis dixerit Romanum Pontificem non habere plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in Universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in eis quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent; aut hanc potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes et singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles: anathema sit.*"

A question will have naturally suggested itself to the reader before he has reached this stage of the proceedings: what were the charges preferred against the Pope? That they were worthy of the criminal gang that invented and propagated the calumnies he will have already suspected. In the histories, where even the most meagre account of the schism appears, it is surmised that one, and the one most dwelt upon, of the allegations accused the saint of leading a scandalous life. It is for this reason that his slaves are so frequently alluded to, as his enemies pretended that they could depose to the irregularity of his conduct. Now, a slave's oath was not accepted as conclusive evidence, according to the canon or the civil law of the day, unless the deponent was subjected to torture, and, naturally enough, the maligned Pontiff refused to hand over the slaves to be tampered with by his calumniators; but he voluntarily undertook to present himself, to allow the examination of every member of his household and to facilitate the acquisition of evidence in every way in his power when the conditions he insisted on as preliminary to his submitting himself to judgment were first fulfilled. The principal of the conditions was that the Papal estates that had been wrested from him by gross violence

and glaring injustice and the Church revenues and personal income that had been similarly seized upon and misappropriated should be restored to him, as he had been pronounced by the King and by the Council legitimate Pontiff and hence the rightful owner or administrator. In other words, he claimed that, in accordance with the canons, everything should be placed in *statu quo ante*, and that then he would answer all charges, however foul, that his adversaries might bring against him. We shall see that, at the King's suggestion, he waived even this reasonable and legal demand, and thus covered his calumniators with confusion and disgrace. Nor ought we to feel staggered by the filthy accusations hurled against this holy and pure ecclesiastic. St. Athanasius and many other saints before and since his day, men of angelic chastity, had to suffer cruelly for the time from similar nasty calumnies, but their terrific ordeals only added new gems to the glorious crowns that awaited them. A disappointed rival without a conscience is dominated by unbridled passions, and an Antipope most faithfully represents on earth the leader of the first rebellion in heaven. His counsel to his disappointed partisans is forcibly expressed by the great author of *Paradise Lost*:

Our better part remains
To work in close design, by fraud or guile,
What force effected not; that He no less
At length from us may find, Who overcomes
By force, hath overcome but half his foe.

It is a singular and a striking fact that neither in the exhaustive reply of Ennodius nor in the acts of any of the councils are the counts of indictment particularized. But the cause of their silence is not far to seek; other allegations they would specify, but a charge of incontinence, however clearly disproved, they shrank from mentioning in connection with the Holy See or its revered occupant. Ennodius, in a very elevated and eloquent passage, alludes to "abominable inventions which ought to be buried in eternal oblivion," and to "accusations so scurvy that their very recital would defile the tongue and taint the atmosphere." And in another passage his eloquence is as telling in effect as it is sublime in conception; he introduces St. Paul as addressing to the accusers those apposite words of his Epistle to the Romans: "You accuse others of perversity, you who are yourselves filled with injustice, with fornication, with avarice, with malice and with envy; laden with murders, always ready to condemn, tricky and jealous. You remind us that nobody ought to hold communication with fornicators, and you are not ashamed to allow all the world to see yourselves in the company and train of the adulterer, Laurence, you vile instruments, which he uses at will to spread his poisons and to expand the area of infection.

And whilst you move in that pestilent company, while you carry the badge of that corrupt rebel, you impute it as a crime to the priests of the Lord to remain attached to the old communion. You pretend to judge us culpable in communicating with a Pontiff whom you have accused no doubt, but whom not an atom of evidence is forthcoming to convict, while you yourselves associate with a man whom the Sacred Scriptures smite with a two-edged sword." These passages leave no room for reasonable doubt as to the nature of the imputations, and the inference they so clearly suggest becomes perfectly irresistible in face of the fact that Pope Symmachus himself, hoping to save others equally guiltless from such foul accusations, got a most extraordinary decree passed in solemn council immediately after peace had been restored, and insisted on its being observed rigidly not by bishops alone, but by priests and deacons as well. In its original form it was devised to safeguard the character of bishops only—*Præceptum quo jussi sunt omnes episcopi cellulos habere*. The Bishop of Milan, in a pastoral letter, which Ennodius mentions and quotes from at great length elsewhere, expressly states that this surprising legislation had been dictated by motives of prudence, in consequence of the calumnies to which the Pontiff of the Apostolic See had been subjected, and the incalculable scandal that had been caused by their circulation. "We must take into account," says the sage and holy bishop, "that some people will be found to believe a thing as long as it is a *possibility* even; we remove all *scandalum infirmorum* by making such conduct on the part of clerics *impossible*; this is secured by having present at all times a companion or witness. Those whose revenues do not permit of their keeping a second priest in the house with them, sleeping in the same apartment at night, can arrange with others in the neighborhood similarly circumstanced, so that two may have their beds in the same or in adjoining rooms. Outside the females sanctioned by the canons, let no woman, especially one unconnected with the house, be admitted save on strict business, and, that over, let her at once depart, lest the reputation even of the most innocent should be compromised."

Again in the passage of the Apologia where the auditor notices, with biting sarcasm, the sneering reference of the opposite party to the class of people that flocked around the venerable Pontiff on his way to stand his trial, he conveys pretty clearly that the Pope's revilers had hinted at unworthy and disreputable motives engendering their sympathy. It is needless to say that the poor and destitute were the special beneficiaries, as they have always been, of the Supreme Pontiff's generosity and the most attached and devoted to his person. Hence when they saw their beloved Bishop and bene-

factor proceeding to the council, to be there charged by his malignant and crime-stained enemies with abominations of which they knew him to be perfectly innocent, it is no wonder that they gathered around him, with frantic manifestations of their grief and indignation.

But the matter is placed entirely outside the pale of doubt or conjecture by a document known as the Manuscript of Verona, discovered about 200 years ago and published in a Roman edition of the lives of certain Popes by a learned compiler named Mianchini. This production is undoubtedly authentic, in the less rigid sense of that word, its author's name being unknown. It was written about the time of the unfortunate schism we are dealing with, and is obviously the work of a strong partisan of the Antipope, as mendacious as it is scurrilous. Since it does not appear to have attracted the notice of most Catholic historians, some extracts from it may prove interesting. The bolder and more enlightened policy, approved by our present illustrious Pontiff, is never to shrink from publishing genuine historical facts and documents, with due distinction of the true and the false. Our Church has nothing to fear and everything to gain from an impartial investigation of all traditional and documentary evidence. "All the pick of the clergy and all the more worthy Senators supported Laurence, who was ordained according to the canons." This statement is an unexaggerated sample of the whole tone and tenor of the Verona Manuscript. In narrating the details of the pleading before the King in Ravenna on behalf of Symmachus it attributes, as we might expect, the royal decision to bribery, though it is utterly repugnant to the estimate all historians form and convey of that Prince's uprightness, to conceive him guilty of corruption. Had he been open to the acceptance of a bribe, Festus was both willing and able to offer him any amount he might name. Another charge is that of heterodox views on the Paschal question; but, as Ennodius deals with this insinuation so summarily, we assume it is only introduced to account for the alleged sojourn of Symmachus at Ravenna to test his orthodoxy. The story hangs so loosely together that its character of fiction is apparent in almost every sentence.

"Numerous crimes brought about, after some years, the impeachment of Symmachus before the King. There was special question of the Paschal Feast, which he celebrated at a different time from that observed by the great body of the faithful. The King summoned him to his presence to give some explanation of this diversity of practice, and obliged himself and the clergy in his immediate entourage to abide at Rimini for some time, with a view to testing their orthodoxy on this point. One evening, as Symmachus was

taking a walk on the seashore, he noticed certain women pass along that he was accused of being too familiar with. They were proceeding to the palace by the King's express orders. Without revealing to anybody that his fears were aroused by what he had remarked, he kept perfectly quiet all night, and then, protected by the darkness, he drove rapidly to Rome and concealed himself within the walls of his palace. The clergy who had been his companions protested to the King that they had neither cognizance nor suspicion of his intended flight. Then the King gave them a mandate to be conveyed to the Senate and the clergy, ordering them to take immediate steps to secure the Pontiff's condemnation and punishment."

Now, if this silly invention rested on the smallest basis of solid fact, is it conceivable that the King would have visited the culprit in state on the occasion of his triumphal entry into Rome and have maintained the most cordial relations with him for many years after? Is it likely that an Arian Prince would have given himself any worry about the differences in the Catholic Church in regard to the celebration of Easter? Would historians have formed a conspiracy of silence on the subject and have spared Symmachus alone, while they invariably exposed such practices no matter by whom else they were followed? But such trashy fictions were quite capable, in the circumstances, of misleading the crowd, who paused not to weigh the probabilities of the case and were absolutely at the mercy of unverified hearsay. Newspapers and telegraph wires were undreamt of; hence contradictions did not follow in hot haste, as they do now, on the heels of lying gossip.

"They accused him, in the second place, of having squandered recklessly the revenues of the Church, in direct contravention of canonical prohibitions, decreed by his predecessors. He had, therefore, incurred the censures attaching to such acts of expenditure. But what contributed most effectively to pull the mask off his pretended uprightness was the infamous *Conditaria*, as she was called in the city, and his open trafficking in holy orders for a fixed price in money. Thus it happened that up to the death of that Pontiff the Roman Church continued in a state of schism." This last assertion is directly contradicted by the statement occurring earlier in the document that "after four years Laurence, of his own motion, to prevent the recurrence of the horrid scenes of civil war, retired to a country residence of the patrician Festus, and passed the rest of his days in self-abnegation of the most exemplary order." That this retirement from the belligerent and tumultuous life he had been leading in the city was *not* resolved upon quite "of his own motion" is obvious from another passage of the same unreliable production:

"The King enjoined on the patrician Festus strict orders to restore all the churches to the regular government and dependence of Symmachus, and to tolerate only one Pontiff at Rome." This royal mandate was issued in 503, after the fourth council presided over by the lawful Pope, and its publication was a most crushing answer to the lying and filthy calumnies with which his enemies sought to sully his high reputation for sanctity and charity. Its issue and execution were too public to allow its existence and purport to be ignored even by the hostile writer of the precious document from which we have been quoting.

It is singular that, having just assured his readers that it was the hasty retreat of Pope Symmachus from Rimini on seeing his accomplices arrive at the palace to give evidence against him on the charge of scandalous conduct, that determined the King's action in having him publicly arraigned before a tribunal of his fellow-bishops, the same inconsistent author should allege that the Paschal irregularities were the chief count in the indictment. "In reference to the Paschal celebration all were unanimous in pressing the King to depute, as Visitor of the Roman Church, the venerable Peter, Bishop of Altinum, and when that solemn festival was over, by order of the King, who acceded to the request of the Senate and the clergy, a council was convened at Rome to inquire into the misdemeanors imputed to the Pope and to pronounce judgment thereon. Some bishops and Senators intrigued against the holding of such a council and proclaimed publicly that no tribunal could take cognizance of charges alleged against the Roman Pontiff, even though such charges were based on actual facts. But the cream of the episcopacy, considering the publicity the matter had attained, were of opinion that it was impossible to avoid a judicial inquiry, as well on the ground of religion as in obedience to the King. These differences produced animated discussions and added fuel to the flames of discord already raging; but at last it was decided that the impeachment should be entertained and officially investigated. Some prelates were despatched to summon Symmachus to appear, but they were repulsed by the clergy at the palace; a second and a third deputation were sent, but he did not condescend to reply. His friends made two strong appeals, at different stages, to the dissentients to return to his allegiance without further examination; but they replied that this course was impossible. Let him prove that he was innocent of the crimes alleged against him, and they would then acknowledge him; otherwise let him be deposed from the priesthood. These delays embittered the feelings of both parties, and the friends of Symmachus among the bishops retired to their respective sees. But all that was sound and uncorrupted in the Church and

Senate persevered in declining to communicate with that Pontiff and petitioned the King in favor of Laurence, whom they recalled from Ravenna, where he was then residing. They proved from the canons that having been elevated to the episcopacy at Rome, it is at Rome he should rule; and for four years he governed the Roman See. It is foreign to our purpose to recount in detail the dreadful havoc effected by these quarrels, which assumed the dimensions of a civil war; many citizens of every order were murdered during that prolonged and desperate conflict. At last Symmachus represented to the King, by despatching the Deacon Dioscorus of Alexandria to the court, the limitless extent of his losses, more particularly in regard to the leading parish churches of Rome, the revenues of which Laurence had appropriated. This recital of grievances deeply moved the King, and he ordered all the churches to resume their allegiance to the Pope."

It is unnecessary to dwell on the contradictions and errors with which this biased effusion everywhere teems. - What we deduce from it as the main charges against the persecuted Symmachus were: First, some vague insinuations as to his being a Quartodeciman. This accusation did not assume definite shape, and is little attended to on either side. Most probably it was introduced merely to create a prejudice against him, as there was a furious craze at the time against all who were suspected of wrong views or practices on the Paschal question. Secondly, it was alleged that he had procured the King's decision in favor of the validity of his election by simoniacal means, and that, according to the laws regulating the elections of all bishops, bribery rendered his appointment null and void. This argument was privately addressed, with much show of virtuous indignation, to bishops and priests, and the accusation was circulated sedulously among the Senators and the people. Dread of the royal anger caused the Laurentian party to observe more caution in public. Besides, next to physical force, bribery was the most powerful weapon that party wielded, since the Emperor of the East had filled, and was prepared at any time to replenish, the coffers of the crafty Festus. Thirdly, the waste of the public funds of the Church was advanced as a crime entailing censure and deposition, but the allegation was regarded as a sort of grim joke, since it emanated from those who had sacrilegiously pillaged the treasures of all the leading basilicas, of which the Pope was no doubt the rightful guardian, and abused the plunder to compass the destruction of its first owner. Fourthly, he was accused of the lowest and most flagitious form of simony, practised in the open sale of holy orders and ecclesiastical preferments to the highest bidder. The particulars adduced to sustain this charge have not been transmitted; but the unsmirched

reputation accorded by most of his contemporaries and by all posterity to the illustrious and saintly victim of these gross calumnies leaves no room to doubt that this accusation was as groundless as the others. Lastly, the abominable fiction about his leading a sinful life and inviting a notorious courtesan, Conditaria, to his palace, throws a lurid light on the character of his accusers and must have intensified immensely the heartfelt sympathy of the vast majority of bishops, priests and people for their cruelly wronged Spiritual Father.

We cannot too urgently or too frequently direct the attention of the reader to the unyielding persistency of the great body of the bishops—here unconsciously attested as a public fact by this anti-papal scribe—with which they utterly disclaimed any jurisdiction to sit in judgment on the recognized Supreme Head of the Church. Ennodius, in his sublime oration, was but the faithful mouthpiece of the *ecclesia docens*; he voiced with eloquence and truth the sentiments of his contemporary successors of the Apostles, and echoed the pure doctrine of a more remote antiquity. Nor did the bishops themselves, individually and collectively, at home in their different sees or assembled together at Rome, fail for a moment to profess from the roof-tops the strong faith that was in them; quite as firmly, though not so eloquently as Ennodius, they all proclaimed that it was the Roman Pontiff alone that could summon them to a synod; that he enjoyed jurisdiction over them all by reason of the primacy of the Holy See. In evidence of this all-important fact, we read in every history dealing with the period that the bishops of Liguria, Emilia and Venetia, being obliged to pass through Ravenna on their journey to Rome, called at the palace and sought an audience with the King. Respectfully but vehemently they represented to him that the supremacy of the Holy See had been at all times recognized by the greatest councils that had ever assembled; that it was the privilege of the Pope alone to summon the prelates of the Church to meet in synod, and that no precedent existed for obliging the Roman Pontiff to submit himself to the judgment of his inferiors. The King replied with characteristic courteousness; Symmachus himself had expressly requested the summoning of the council; therefore, he was only carrying out the wishes of the Pope. Finally he permitted them to see for themselves the Pope's letter, in which he had begged the King to have the bishops convened with his authority and acquiescence. When they arrived in Rome Symmachus confirmed the accuracy of the King's explanation in every detail, and added that he was deeply grateful to that noble-minded Prince for having so promptly given effect to his wishes. He assured them they might proceed to attend the episcopal synod without any scru-

ples of conscience, as it was virtually by his command they were summoned. This incident possesses a deep and far-reaching significance; the all-wise Providence could not permit such an occurrence to pass unrecorded; it was a gleam of light revealing unbroken belief in an important dogma. But before proceeding to treat of this council in detail the order of events demands that we first give a brief account of the royal visit to Rome, where Theodoric made his first official entry in the September of 500.

With this we shall commence our next article.

E. MAGUIRE.

Vienne, France.

THE FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF COMMON PRAYER.

RELYING principally on Heylyn's and Canon Dixon's admissions, together with the significant fact that no mention is made in Wilkins' Concilia of any convocation of the bishops between December 26, 1547, and January 24, 1552, the learned authors of "Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer" have come to the conclusion that the Book itself never passed through Convocation.

Heylyn states in his "History of Edward VI." (p. 67) that the high Church or Catholic party, as they were then called, contended, at the time of its promulgation, "that neither the undertaking was advised nor the book itself approved in a synodical way by the bishops and clergy, but that it was only the act of some few of the prelates employed therein by the King or Lord Protector, without the knowledge and approbation of the rest."

Summoning to His Royal Presence, on September 1, 1549, the bishops and divines whom he had formerly employed for drawing up the "Form for administering Communion under both kinds in the English tongue," the King commanded them to frame a new public Liturgy, which should contain Morning and Evening prayer, together with a method "of administering the sacraments and sacramentals, and for celebrating all other public offices which were required for good Christian people; which, as His Majesty commanded, out of a most religious zeal for the honour of God, the edification of his subjects, and to the peace of his dominions; so they (who knew no better sacrifice than obedience) did cheerfully apply themselves to the undertaking." (Heylyn, 64.)

Taking the Latin Missals, Breviaries and ancient Liturgies as their groundwork, the bishops and divines deputed to compose the new Liturgy made what they considered judicious selections from the materials at their disposal by omitting the parts rejected by reformers as superstitious, whilst retaining other portions which, while unoffensive to the reformers, were likely to find favor with those who still adhered to the last remnants of the ancient faith. The great aim of the committee, according to Burnet (Vol. II., p. 73), "was to retain such things as the Primitive Church had practised, cutting off such abuses as the latter ages had grafted on to them, and to continue the use of other things which, though they had not been brought in so early, yet were of good use to beget devotion and were so recommended to the people by the practice of them that they, laying these aside, would perhaps have alienated them from the other changes." "The blessing of water, salt, bread, incense, candles, fire, bells, churches, images, altars, crosses, vessels, vestments, palms and flowers was in future to be omitted as superstitions."

The Committee decided that in future divine service should be conducted in the English tongue. The strongest reason urged for this change was the teaching of St. Paul (I. Cor. xiv.) who was said to have condemned the use of unknown tongues in the Church. It will, however, be evident to every unprejudiced and intelligent reader of the context that the Apostle meant only to condemn the conduct of certain disciples, who, possessing the gift of tongues, persisted, through vanity, in preaching in a language unknown to their congregations. (See I. Cor. xiv., 2, 6, 9, 23, 28.) St. Paul's condemnation, it is needless to add, has no reference to the use of the Latin language in the divine service. Even in public exhortations he professes himself willing to allow preaching in an unknown tongue if an interpreter be present (v. 28). But the language of the Catholic Liturgy has been translated into vernacular, and this translation is found in books of devotion side by side with the ancient Latin. It is evident from this that the argument based on the words of St. Paul is entirely irrelevant.

Nothing was said by the Committee, when discussing the Sacraments, concerning penance or the necessity of auricular confession. The reason of this reticence was that the Council by proclamation had lifted both questions beyond the region of disputation. It may perhaps here be interesting to mention an historical dispute which took place between Collier and Burnet, two Church historians representing respectively the views of the High and Low Church Schools of thought in the Church of England, concerning the doctrine of Sacramental Confession. Burnet advanced certain propositions unfavorable to the Sacrament, one being "that confession to a priest

is nowhere enjoined in the Sacred Scriptures" and another "that in the Primitive Church there was no obligation of confessing secret sin, since all the Canons referred to public scandal," and thus confession had ceased with the abolition of public penance.

Collier, a high Church historian, replies (Vol. V., p. 258) that St. James (v. 16) lays down the necessity of confessing "one to another" and that this exhortation refers to verse 14, where the sick person is directed to call in the elders of the Church, that they might pray over him, "anointing him with oil." A parallel illustration which is given in explanation of the text is taken from I. Peter v., 5, where the Apostle commands us to be "subject one to another." To take these words literally would be to destroy all government and distinction in the Church, and what is worse, would end in contradiction, for it makes every one both subject and superior with respect to the same person and at the same time. But God "is not the author of dissension" (I. Cor. xiv., 33). To be "subject," therefore, "one to another" can only mean that persons who are placed in a subordinate position should not affect a leveling tendency, but submit to authority. By a parity of reasoning the text in St. James of "confessing one to another" must be understood of the sick man confessing his sins to the elders or priests of the Church.

The power of "binding and loosing" (Matthew xviii., 18), which Burnet mentioned as "simply declarative," Collier defends as follows: If, by declarative, Burnet means that priests have no such power in their commission to absolve the penitent, and that the absolution, if pronounced by a layman, would have the same signification—if this be his meaning, what construction can be placed on our Saviour's words to the Apostles:

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost.

"Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained" (John xx., 23).

And can we imagine that words so plain in the expression and so solemn on the occasion are so void of weight and signification? They must amount to this at least; that those who neglect this ordinance of God and refuse to apply for absolution to persons thus authorized shall not have their sins forgiven them, though otherwise not unqualified.

Public penances were often inflicted in the early Church for sins secretly confessed, but there was nothing, when scandal would arise, in the penances given to indicate the nature of the sin committed. Collier proves this by quoting Saint Basil: "*Adulterio pollutas mulieres, et confitentes ob pietatem publicare quidem patres nostri prohibuerunt, eas autem stare sine communione, jusserunt, donec impleatur tempus penitentiae.*" These escaped the discipline of the *flentes, audi-*

entes and *substrati*, and were immediately ranged with the Consistentes to prevent the discovery of their sin. From Sozomen we gather (Lib. 7, Cap. 16) that "it was customary to appoint, as penitentiary, some priest eminent for his prudence and regular behavior, but especially one who was remarkable for his secrecy." Now, as Collier asks Burnet, why should this latter qualification be thought so necessary in a penitentiary if confessional secrecy were not considered necessary?

The confession of a scandalous sin made publicly by a lady in the presence of a whole congregation induced Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to issue an order for the discontinuance of public penance within his province, A. D. 390. This seems to have been the signal for the general abolition of public penitential discipline throughout the whole Church, although when it passed away auricular confession, which always existed before it and will ever exist, still remained.

With the abolition of public penances the office of the public penitentiary lapsed and the faithful were left free to select their own Confessors. To prevent, however, any undue harshness on the part of Confessors towards their penitents, books calculated to limit private penances according to the number and degrees of sin were composed for the priests' instruction and guidance.

These penance books were common amongst the Irish and British Catholics in the fifth century, according to Alzog (*Church Hist.*, Vol. I., p. 513) and in the kingdom of the Franks at the time of Saint Columbanus (A. D. 615).

Returning again to the bishops and divines assembled in committee at Windsor, as a result of their inquiry into the teaching of the Primitive Church they decided, in deference to the authority of Tertullian (A. D. 220) to retain the sign of the Cross. The words of that great writer are certainly very convincing.

"At every step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on seat, in all ordinary actions of daily life we trace upon our foreheads the sign [of the Cross]. If for these and other such rules you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction you will find none. Tradition will be set forth as the originator, custom as the strengthener and faith as the observer." (*De Corona*, Vol. I., p. 336).^{*} Liturgy requiring that the priest "should make a cross upon the child's forehead and breast at baptism, say," etc., etc.

^{*} We have employed and when quoting the early writers shall employ throughout our article the translation published by J. & J. Clark, Edinburgh, in the *Ante-Nicene Library*, 1870.

The ancient ceremony of exorcising the devil was also to be continued, and it was countenanced by the authority of Saint Augustine, after which, to quote the rubric, "The priest shall take the child in his hands . . . and shall dip it in the water thrice, first dipping the right side, second the left side and the third time dipping the face towards the font." Afterwards the child should be anointed with chrism.

Tertullian, St. Cyprian and the *Apostolic Constitutions* supplied the warrant for the ceremony of anointing the baptized. Tertullian's words are these: "When we have issued from the font we are thoroughly anointed (a practice derived) from the old discipline, wherein on entering the priesthood (men) were wont to be anointed with oil from a horn. . . . Thus in our case the unction runs (down the flesh) carnally, but profits spiritually in the same way as the act of baptism itself too is carnal, in which we are plunged in water, the effect spiritual in that we are freed from sins." (De Baptismo, Cap. 7.)

St. Cyprian, martyred 258, holds the same doctrine. "It is necessary," he states, "that he should be anointed who is baptized, so that having received the Chrism, that is the anointing, he may be anointed of God, and have in him the grace of Christ." (Epistle 69.) In the *Apostolic Constitutions* the following instructions are given to bishops: "Then, therefore, O bishop, according to that type shall you anoint the head of those that are to be baptized, whether they be men or women, with the holy oil of spiritual baptism. After that either thou, O bishop, or a presbyter that is under thee, shall in the solemn form name over them the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and shall dip them in water, and let the deacon receive the man, and the deaconess the woman, that so the conferring of this inviolable seal may take place with becoming decency. And after that let the bishop anoint those with ointment." (Lib. 3, p. 105.)

The anointing at Confirmation, which in the first ages of the Church followed closely after baptism, is also a primitive custom, and as such was sanctioned by the committee.

The form sanctioned in the New Liturgy for conferring this sacrament was: "Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be thine forever by the virtue of Thy Holy Cross and Passion; confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of Thy Holy Ghost. Amen."

"And since the soul, in consequence of its salvation, is chosen to the service of God," says Tertullian, "it is the flesh that renders it actually capable of such service. The flesh indeed is washed in order that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be con-

secreated; the flesh is signed [with the sign of the Cross] that the soul may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed with the imposition of hands that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh feeds on the Body and Blood of Christ that the soul may fatten on God." (De Resurrectione Carnis, Vol. II., Cap. 8, p. 229.)

At marriage the ring and gold and silver tokens were to be given and the priest was instructed to bless them with the sign of the Cross.

With regard to the sacrament of extreme unction, it was ordered that if the sick person wished to be anointed the priest "should anoint him upon the forehead and breast only, making the sign of the Cross, saying the words, 'As with the visible oil thy body outwardly is anointed,' etc., etc."

Anointing the sick with oil is a Scriptural custom. St. Mark (vi., 13) states that the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them." The instructions of St. James (v., 14, 15) are clearer still:

V. 14. "Is any sick amongst you? Let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."

V. 15. "And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him."

Prayers and oblations for the dead, as evidently of ancient usage, were also included in the First Common Prayer Book. The words of Tertullian and St. Cyprian were too clear to allow of tergiversation on this matter. "As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birthday honors" are the words of Tertullian (De Corona, p. 336). The same writer represents a widow as "praying for the soul of her deceased husband, and requesting refreshment [for him] in the first resurrection, and she offers [her sacrifice] on the anniversary of his falling to sleep." (De Monogamia, Vol. III., Cap. 10, p. 41.)

St. Cyprian, more explicit still, asks his brethren to "take note of the days on which 'the faithful' depart, that we may celebrate their commemoration amongst the memorials of the martyrs, although Tertullus, our faithful and devoted brother, who, in addition to the solicitude and care which he shows to the brethren in all service of labor, is not wanting in that respect in any care of their bodies, has written and does write and intimate to me the days on which our beloved brethren in prison pass by the gate of a glorious death to their immortality; and these are celebrated by oblations and sacrifices for their commemorations; which things, with the Lord's protection, we shall celebrate with you." (Epist. 36, Sect. 2.)

In his letter to Cornelius St. Cyprian makes this beautiful ex-

hortation: "Let us remember one another in concord and unanimity. Let us, on both sides, always pray for one another. Let us relieve burdens and afflictions by mutual love, that if any one of us by the swiftness of divine condescension shall go hence the first, our love may continue in the presence of the Lord and our prayers for our brethren and sisters not cease in the presence of the Father's mercy. I bid you, dearest brother, ever heartily, farewell." (Epist, 36, Sect. 5.)

Collier takes care to observe "that though the Church of England dislikes the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, we cannot from this infer her dislike of prayers for the dead" (Vol. V., p. 292).

Now what this excellent historian calls the "Romish doctrine of Purgatory" seems marvelously to agree with the teaching of Origen. (b. A. D. 185, d. 254.) These are his words: "For this cause, therefore, he that is saved is saved by fire, that if he happens to have anything in the nature of lead commingled with him, that fire may burn and melt it away that all men may become pure gold, because the gold of the land, which the saints possess, is said to be pure; and as the furnace trieth gold, so doth temptation try the just. (Eccl. ii., 5.) All therefore must come to the fire; all must come to the furnace, for the Lord sits and He shall purify the sons of Judah. But, also, when we shall have come to this place, if one shall have brought many good works and some little iniquity, that little is melted away and purifies in the fire like lead, and all remains pure gold." (Hom. 6 in Exod. Compare I. Cor. iii., 12 to 15.)

The same author declares that heaven is the final reward of Christians who "after their apprehension and their chastisements for their offenses, which they have undergone by way of purgation, may, after having fulfilled and discharged every obligation, deserve a habitation in that land, whilst those who have been obedient to the Word of God and have henceforth by their obedience shown themselves capable of wisdom, deserve that kingdom of heaven or heavens, and thus the prediction is more worthily fulfilled, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall possess the land.' (De Principiis, Vol I., p. 90.)"

In the Communion Service in the First Liturgy that part which immediately precedes the words of consecration presupposed a sacrificial oblation. The rubric, however, which forbade any elevation or adoration of the sacred elements after consecration bears witness to the Calvinistic bias of some of the members of the committee.

Now it is easy to gather the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice from the writings of Justin Martyr, who died A. D. 166. In his famous dialogue with Trypho, a learned Jew, he clearly proves the Eucharistic sacrifice from the Prophet Malachi i., 11: "The offering of fine flour which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those

purified from leprosy was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed in remembrance of the suffering He endured on behalf of those who are purified from all iniquity, in order that we may at the same time thank God for having created the world with all things therein, for the sake of man and for delivering us from evil in which we were, and for utterly overthrowing the principalities and powers, by Him who suffered according to His will. Hence God speaks by the mouth of Malachi, one of the twelve [prophets], as I said before, about the sacrifices of that time presented by you. 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, and I will not accept your sacrifices at your hands, for from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, My name hath been glorified among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to My name and a pure offering, for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord, but ye profane it.' He then speaks of those Gentiles, namely, us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, *i. e.*, the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist, affirming both that we glorify His name and that you profane it." (Dialogue with Trypho, Chap. 41.)

Listen to St. Cyprian on the Christian Priesthood and sacrifice: "Who is more a priest of the most High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered Himself a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same thing that Melchisideck had offered, that is, bread and wine, to wit, His body and blood," (Epistle 62, Sec. 4). Again he continues: "If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God is Himself a priest of God the Father and has offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ who imitates that which Christ did, and he offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ to have offered." (Epistle 62, Sec. 14.)

Describing a scene which occurred whilst he himself was saying Mass, St. Cyprian writes: "A woman, who in advanced life and of more mature age, secretly crept in among us when we were sacrificing, received not food but a sword for herself, and as if taking some deadly poison into her jaws and body, began presently to be tortured and to become stiffened with frenzy and suffering the misery, no longer of persecution, but of her crime, shivering and trembling she fell down. The crime of her dissimulated conscience was not long unpunished or concealed." (De Lapsis, Sect. 26, p. 369.)

The prayer before consecration in the First Common Prayer Book was as follows: "O God, heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon

the Cross for our Redemption, who made these (by His one oblation once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in His holy Gospel, command us to celebrate a perpetual memory of His precious death until His coming again, hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, who in the same night that He was betrayed took bread, and when He had blessed and given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take, eat, this is My Body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me.' Likewise after supper He took the cup and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of this, for this is My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you, and for many, for remission of sins. Do this as often as you shall drink it in remembrance of Me.' "

The rubric added was: "These words before rehearsed are to be said turning still to the altar without any elevation or showing the sacrament to the people." This rubric, more than any other reason, caused the bishops of Catholic tendencies to vote against the New Liturgy when it was presented at the House of Lords.

The Eucharist sacrifice is called in the First Common Prayer Book "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." The rubric directs that "at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white albe, plain, with a vestment or cope. And where there be many priests or deacons, so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration as shall be requisite, and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, albes and tunicles."

Presented to Parliament for the third reading on January 15, 1549, the New Liturgy received the sanction of the House of Lords and the approval of the King and Council. Thirteen bishops voted in its favor and eleven against it. If some of the absentee bishops, whose Catholic views were notorious, had been present to record their votes on the occasion the minority would be converted into a majority.

Received by the Lutherans as a mere instalment of the Reformation, condemned by Calvinists as strongly savoring of the "ancient superstition," and accepted with sullen acquiescence by all who still cherished the ancient faith, the First Book of Common Prayer was, from its infancy, doomed to die. The Catholic party viewed it with

particular distrust because, as has already been remarked, the elevation and adoration of the Blessed Sacrament after consecration were forbidden by the rubric, whilst at the same time the doctrine of the Real Presence was neither affirmed nor denied, but skilfully avoided.

It would appear that many bishops and priests, while carrying out the New Liturgy in public to escape the penalties attaching to its non-observance, continued in private to celebrate Mass according to the ancient rite. Bonner, Bishop of London, and the clergy of St. Paul's seem to have incurred the displeasure of the Council by this offense, as the letter of censure addressed to the bishop on June 24, 1549, clearly indicates.

Soon after the complete suppression of the insurrections provoked by the forcible promulgation of the New Liturgy the Council succeeded in inducing Parliament to pass an act in November, 1549, "for taking down such images as were still remaining in the churches, also for calling in all antiphonaries, missals, breviaries, offices, horaries, primers and processional with other books of false and superstitious worship."

The passing of this act was announced by Royal Proclamation, and Cranmer, in a circular letter to all the suffragan bishops, commanded them to enforce it in all their dioceses. Whilst the Archbishop of Canterbury's imported divines, Peter Martyr at Oxford and Martin Bucer at Cambridge, were openly denouncing the doctrine of the Real Presence, Calvin, who, to use Collier's words, "thought himself wiser than all the Fathers of the Primitive Church," commenced a fierce onslaught on the First Common Prayer Book. Heylyn's estimate of Calvin's vanity is just as contemptuous as Collier's. "Thinking nothing well done except what was either done by him or by his direction, . . . Calvin must needs be meddling in such matters as belonged not to him." (Heylyn, p. 80.)

In his letters to the Lord Protector, the archreformer condemned the ancient custom of anointing at Baptism, Confirmation and Extreme Unction, whilst he held up his hands in horror at prayers for the dead.

Calvin found an unexpected ally in his attempts to reform the First Common Prayer Book in the person of Hooper, the Bishop-elect of Gloucester, who asked to be excused from wearing episcopal vestments during the coming consecration service. Supported by Ridley, now Bishop of London, Cranmer humbly craved not to obey the King, who, influenced by Warwick, wished to accede to Hooper's request, and was so successful in his opposition that Hooper, who continued obstinate, was committed to the Tower. Still bent on fomenting dissension from his prison, the bishop-elect

addressed letters to Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr requesting their opinions on the merits of his case. Calvin now came forward with the suggestion that Hooper should be required to wear episcopal vestments during his consecration service, but dispensed from wearing them afterwards, and this suggestion was gratefully accepted by both parties.

This discussion gave rise to an agitation amongst the reforming clergy throughout England against the use of episcopal and priestly vestments, and finally led to their abolition.

The altars were not destined to long survive the priestly robes. Hooper, when preaching in the royal presence in the year 1550, maintained that the only remedy for the religious anarchy then prevalent was the substitution of tables for altars, so that the people might be effectually dissuaded from believing in the Eucharistic sacrifice.

This sermon was received by all the courtiers present with warm approval, not that they cared much for the theological aspect of the question, but for a more lucrative reason, "they promised themselves no small hope of profit by the disfranchising of altars, hangings, palls, plate and other rich utensils which every parish had more or less provided for them, and that this consideration might prevail upon them as much as any other, if perhaps not more, may be collected from an inquiry made about two years after, in which it was asked what jewels, crosses, candlesticks, censers, chalices, copes and other vestments were then remaining in any of the Cathedral or parochial churches or otherwise had been embezzled or taken away, leaving only one chalice to every church, with a cloth for the communion table being thought sufficient." (Heylyn, p. 95.)

The influence of the Calvinistic party in England hastened the current of events which tended to leave the Anglican Churches in "all the nakedness and simplicity" of their own conventicles. Without the sanction of either Convocation or Parliament, a letter dated November 24, 1550, bearing the royal seal and subscribed by Somerset and the rest of the Council, was addressed to Ridley commanding him to substitute tables for altars in all the churches and chapels of his diocese. The Bishop of London rigorously carried out the orders of Council in his own diocese, but Heylyn (p. 97) states that "no universal change of altars into table took place until the first New Liturgy was repealed."

In the meantime all those bishops who were opposed to further reformation were either deprived of their sees, heavily fined, or coerced into helpless submission. Gardiner, of Winchester; Bonner, of London; Tunstal, of Durham; Day, of Chichester; Heath, of Worcester, and Voysey, of Exeter, were deprived of their sees.

Kitchen, of Llandaff; Salcot, of Salisbury, and Sampson, of Lichfield, submitted with such evident reluctance that most of their diocesan estates were confiscated by the Crown. Thirlby, of Westminster; Skyp, of Hereford; Aldrich, of Carlisle; King, of Oxford; Parfue, of St. Asaphs, and Gooderich, of Ely, notwithstanding their well-known Catholic sympathies, were helplessly carried on by the tide of the reformation. Rugg, of Norwich, resigned his see to save his conscience.

Any one who closely reads the discussions which took place at Windsor before the form for administering Holy Communion under both kinds was finally settled by the committee of divines will come to the conclusion that only four bishops, viz., Cranmer, Ridley, Ferrars and Holbeach, heartily accepted the latest doctrines of the Reformation in the beginning of this reign. But these four bishops, backed up as they were by the powerful influence of the "Pirates of the Council," as Heylyn calls them, easily put their opponents to the rout.

The ranks of the Lutheran and Calvinistic bishops in the Church of England were materially strengthened by the prelates appointed to the sees left vacant by the deprivation or retirement of the bishops of Catholic tendencies who had the courage of their opinions. Ridley succeeded Bonner (deprived) in the See of London; Poynt first succeeded Ridley as Bishop of Rochester and was afterwards appointed to the See of Winchester in place of Gardiner (deprived). Miles Coverdale succeeded Voysey, Bishop of Exeter (deprived). Hooper was appointed to the See of Gloucester, left vacant by the death of Wakeham. Scory succeeded Day, of Chichester (deprived). No one was appointed to succeed Heath, of Worcester (deprived). Westminster was left vacant after the subservient Thirlby's promotion, and Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, was kept in prison until the dissolution of his bishopric by act of Parliament.

Ferrars, of St. Davids, was the first bishop consecrated according to the form of the New Ordinal, and his consecration took place, according to Heylyn, before the New Ordinal had received the sanction of Parliament. Miles Coverdale, consecrated on August 13, 1551, and Scory, elevated to the episcopate two days afterwards, were the next in succession according to the same authority. (Edward VI., p. 98.)

The revision of the First Common Prayer Book occupied the entire year of 1551.

With unwearying persistency Calvin had been employing all his great influence since the First Liturgy had received the sanction of Parliament in 1549, with the view to securing its revision and the introduction in its stead of a Liturgy more in harmony with his own

doctrines. He had written numerous letters to the Protector, the King, the Council and the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject; as he himself states in a letter to Bullinger written on the 29th of August, he urged them to proceed to such a reformation as he himself had projected. Nothing short of this, he declared, would satisfy his followers. In his letters to the King he insisted that many things were still amiss in the State of the Kingdom and stood in grave need of reformation; while in letters to Cranmer he laments that in the service of the Church, as then it stood, there remained a whole mass of Popery which did not only darken, but even destroy God's holy worship. But, "fearing that he might not prevail with so wise a Prince, assisted by such a prudent Council and such learned prelates, he hath his agents in the Court, the country and the universities, by whom he drives on his design at all parts at once." (Heylyn, p. 107.)

Collier fastens the whole blame for altering the First Liturgy on Calvin, Bucer and Peter Martyr, in other words, on three foreigners. "Calvin, who thought himself wiser than the ancient Church and fit to dictate religion to all countries in Christendom, has taken some pains in this matter. In one of his letters to Cranmer he speaks disgracefully of the English Reformation; that there was so much Popery and intolerable stuff in it still remaining that the pure worship of God was not only weakened, but in a manner stifled and overlaid with it."

"Bucer was a strong second to Calvin, and Peter Martyr agreed with Bucer's amendments, as appears by his letter, in which there are some remarkable passages. He gives God thanks for making himself and Bucer instrumental in putting the bishops in mind of the exceptionable places in the Common Prayer Book. He declares that the Archbishop Cranmer told him that they had met for this purpose and resolved on a great many alterations, but what their corrections were Cranmer did not explain. He adds that Sir John Cheek (the King's tutor) told him that if the bishops refused to consent to altering what was necessary, the King was resolved to do it himself and recommend his revision to the next session of Parliament." (Vol. V., p. 433.)

The meeting of the bishops mentioned by Cranmer took place in 1550. As all the lately elected bishops were ultra reformers and as the old "Catholic bishops" who attended were cowed into docile submission by the punishment already inflicted on their brethren, no difficulty was experienced by Cranmer in persuading the bishops to agree to a revision of the First Common Prayer Book and to depute a committee of bishops and learned men for that purpose.

When at length Parliament, in 1552, sanctioned the revision of

the First Liturgy, with singular inconsistency it passed a grand eulogium on its perfection before according it a reverential burial. The act states firstly "that there was nothing in the book but what was agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, and very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation and most profitable to the estate of this realm. Secondly, that such doubts which had been raised in the use and exercise thereof proceeded rather from the curiosity of the Minister and mistakers than from any worthy cause, and therefore, thirdly, that the said book should be faithfully perused, explained and made fully perfect in all such places in which it was necessary to be made earnest and fit for stirring up all Christian people to the true honoring of Almighty God." (Act 5, Ed. VI., cap. 1.)

All who still cherished the last remnants of the Ante-Nicene Church must have been shocked at finding that the Second Common Prayer Book did not sanction the sign of the Cross, the ceremonies of anointing at Baptism and Confirmation nor prayers and oblations for the dead. Many, too, were horrified on finding it explained that although kneeling was prescribed by the rubric in receiving Holy Communion, "no adoration was intended or ought to be done either to the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their own natural substances and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians." (Collier v., 434.) Thus, for the first time, the Church of England openly denied the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament and in the Sacrifice of the Mass, which supposes that penance, prayers and oblations for the dead found no place in the revised Liturgy.

St. Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, who with the "*Apostolic Constitutions*" had been quoted as witnesses to the doctrines and practices of the Ante-Nicene Church as set forth in the First Common Prayer Book, were now scornfully set aside; even the authority of Saint Mark (vi., 13) and St. James (v., 14, 15) could not preserve the Sacrament of Extreme Unction from the condemnation of Calvin's disciples.

Many respected members of the Church of England at the present day are of opinion that the Second Book of Common Prayer ought to be interpreted by the First, which bears the "imprimatur" of Parliament. The reasons assigned for the revision of the First Liturgy, viz., "the desire to meet the wishes of mistakers," who, to quote Collier's words, "had more scruples than understanding," furnishes, they affirm, no ground for the abolition of the First Common Prayer Book. It follows, then, that when the Second Book of Common

Prayer was first promulgated it still remained lawful to accept the doctrines and practise the ceremonies authorized in the First Book. It remained still lawful to sign oneself with the sign of the Cross, privately at least to pray for the souls departed, and they could still call in the priests of the Church to administer Extreme Unction, for this sacrament, though omitted from the Second Liturgy, was, they contend, not condemned by it. The connection which exists between the First Book of Common Prayer and the one in use at present is practically the same as that which existed between the First and Second Liturgy during King Edward's reign. High Churchmen, therefore, cannot fairly be called dishonest when they claim the right to make the sign of the Cross, to use the ceremonies of anointing at Baptism, Confirmation and Extreme Unction and to pray for the dead, as these ceremonies and rites were pronounced by Parliament in the sanction which it gave to the First Liturgy to be in accordance with Scripture and early tradition, whilst they are only omitted but not condemned in the Second.

For a similar reason Anglicans are justified in holding the doctrines of the Real Presence and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, since these doctrines find their warrant in the First Book of Common Prayer.

But if the truth of the contention of the High Church party were, however, granted, the members of that party would still have to face the difficulty of belonging to a Church the majority of whose followers in the present day differ from them in faith. What may be the truth of this contention is not for us to decide, nor is it our business to discover how High Churchmen can reconcile it with their conscience to belong to a Church most of whose members deny every one of those doctrines to which High Churchmen so rigidly adhere. Bishops like Gardiner, Bonner, Day, Tunstal, Heath and Voysey submitted cheerfully to imprisonment and deprivation rather than accept the attenuated form of "Catholicity" which finally found expression in the Second Book of Common Prayer, with the Ordinal and Articles attached.

Kitchen, of Llandaff; Salcot, of Salisbury, and Sampson, of Lichfield, suffered most of their diocesan estates to be confiscated before reluctantly submitting to the latest reforms.

Anglican clergymen should ever remember the words of Bonner before his condemnation by the Commission at Lambeth for preaching Catholic doctrine at St. Paul's Cross: "I have a right to three things," said he, "a few effects, a poor carcass and my soul. The first two you may make a prize of, but I will keep the last out of your power."

WILLIAM FLEMING.

London, England.

DIVINE ELEMENT IN SCRIPTURE—REVELATION.

IN Holy Scripture we have a Book that has solved more of the problems of life, that has awakened more lofty sentiments, that has aroused more genuine religious enthusiasm, that has prompted to more heroic deeds, that has inspired more useful lives, and that has helped to make men more gentle and manly, more truthful and honest, both as citizens and as Christians, than any other book ever written. In fact, it has exercised such a stupendous influence on the civilized world that we may rightly infer that there must be some strange power lodged within its pages; and the question naturally suggests itself, What is the secret of this power? How is this singular, this widespread, this permanent influence of the Book to be accounted for? What is it that gives to Holy Writ so firm a hold on the best and the noblest of our race? It is because Scripture is a *Divine* Book.

In all ages of the Christian Church the Bible has been, in some way, considered Divine and has been called "The Divine Word," "The Divine Book," "The Divine Oracles," "Divine Writ," "The Divine Library of Holy Scripture." But in what sense or, rather, in how many senses is Scripture Divine? And wherein consists its Divinity? To avoid confusion in the use of the term it may be well to make a clear distinction between two senses of the word when applied to the good Book, for Scripture is Divine in two ways: (1) By reason of its *Contents*, and (2) By reason of its *Author*.

Holy Scripture is Divine on account of its contents, on account of the topics handled in it, on account of the subject matter treated in it, on account of the truths taught in it—all of which are Divine, in so far as they treat of God and "the deep things of God." Understood in this sense, as indicating the character of the contents, Divinity is not peculiar to Scripture alone, but is common to many other books, such as the "Divina Commedia" of Dante, as well as the works of many theological writers.

In the same sense many traditions of the Church are called "Divine," to distinguish them from such as are merely ecclesiastical, Apostolic or even human in character. In the same sense, that is, for teaching so many of "the deep things of God," St. John has been called the "Divine," "O Theologos." In the same sense a student of theology is often called a student of Divinity. Therefore, if the topics discussed in a book refer directly to God, the book, whether it is inspired or not, may be properly called, and is, Divine.

Again, Holy Scripture is called Divine on account of its origin,

on account of the Divine Source from whence it proceeded, on account of the Divine Cause by which it was produced, on account of the Divine Author by whom it was composed. In this, case, whatever may be the character of the contents of the book, whether Divine or not, the *book* is Divine, because it was composed by a Divine Person and "has God for its Author." The book, considered merely as a written document, that is *qua scriptus*, is the result of a supernatural operation of God exercised on the human writer, both urging him to write and assisting him while in the act of writing, in such a way that God becomes the primary Author of the book so written and man the secondary author. In this case the book is Divine, because the act of composing it is a Divine act and was performed by God, through the instrumentality of man.

Thus the Divinity of Scripture includes two ideas, (1) Divine Topics, Contents or Truths, and (2) Divine Authorship or Composition. In other and fewer words, there are in Scripture two distinct Divine elements, the one called *Revelation* and the other *Inspiration*.

There seems not to be any other way to make clear to the reader the distinction between these two words Revelation and Inspiration than to define each absolutely, and then to consider them relatively to each other, comparing or contrasting the one with the other, to see wherein they agree and wherein they differ. But to do this will take both time and space. Therefore, reserving the question of Inspiration for future consideration, we shall, in the present article, speak only of

I. REVELATION.

The word Revelation is somewhat ambiguous and needs defining. It is one of the many figurative words borrowed from the Latin for the purpose of enriching our language. It is used in a great variety of senses. Literally and in its broadest signification, it denotes the removal of a veil, in order that what lies behind it may be seen. It is the putting aside of a veil, in order that what was before concealed may be discovered. It is the act of disclosing to view something previously hidden. The word is sometimes extended to the disclosure of a material object or of some concrete thing, event, institution or person; and it is sometimes limited to utterances that embody a truth, whether theoretical or practical. It is taken in an *Active* sense when it denotes the act itself of manifesting truth; it is taken in a *Passive* sense when it denotes the result of such act, the truth or collection of truths so revealed, the knowledge thus obtained.

Revelation may be either *Human* or *Divine*. Revelation is human when it is man who reveals. In this sense the present article may be a revelation to such of its readers as may not be familiar with

the subject matter. But of human revelation nothing more need be said. Revelation is Divine when it is God who reveals. Divine Revelation, taken in its broadest sense, includes every manifestation of God to man, no matter whether made through conscience or through the constitution of the human mind, as is sometimes assumed, or through the harmony prevailing in the universe, or through the process of the divine government of the world, or through the framework of physical nature. It embraces the entire compass of Divine disclosure, whether in word or in work, whether in the direct contact of the spirit of God on the spirit of man, whether of truth in general or of some special concrete fact, or disposition of the Divine Will in an individual case.

Every Divine Revelation implies a Subject, an Object and a Recipient, that is, a subject or agent revealing, an object, person, thing or truth revealed, and a person to whom the revelation is made. Now the *Subject* or Revealer is God; for, in the last analysis, God must be the only ultimate source of knowledge about Himself, His existence, His attributes and His relations to His creatures. The *Object* or Person revealed is also God. The Revealer reveals Himself before all else, and thus the Subject and the Object blend into one. In Scripture every providential act of God manifests either His Power, or His Wisdom, or His Justice, or His Mercy, or His Truthfulness, or His Grace, or His Holiness; or shows Him to be a God to be feared, to be obeyed, to be trusted, to be loved. The one object, then, that underlies all Divine revelation is not so much a speculative truth as it is God Himself, the concrete being of the One, Holy, Living God, in His infinite nature and divine attributes.

The *Recipient* of the Revelation is man. Every revelation necessarily presupposes reason, a faculty capable of apprehending, if not of comprehending, the terms in which the revelation is expressed. It is evidently in the nature of things that no revelation can be made to a stone or a stump, to a dumb beast or even to an idiot. Intelligence of some kind is essential to revelation of any kind, and a higher order of intelligence is a prerequisite to a higher order of revelation. It would be a meagre knowledge of "the deep things of God" that could be imparted to and appropriated by a Choctaw Indian on his Western reservation or a savage in his native forest. The requisite faculty for receiving a revelation may indeed be there, but it is found in him only remotely and radically, and needs to be developed by methods of education adapted to the nature and laws of mind.

Divine Revelation may be either *Natural* or *Supernatural*. Divine Revelation is Natural when God reveals Himself, His existence or His attributes through the light of human reason acting on the

works of God—on the world. All nature is an open book, from the study of which man, by the proper exercise of his intellectual faculties, can rise from the knowledge of the creature to the knowledge of the Creator, or from the existence of the effect can infer the existence of the first great cause, which is God. The Creation of the world is itself an instance of God's coming forth from the silent depths and vast solitudes of His mysterious Being. We must, of course, confess that not all men have as complete a knowledge of God as is mirrored forth in nature. But that is their own fault; for such knowledge has been placed within their reach. They have not put the right interpretation upon the facts of revelation. All men see the same sun, but not all see it alike. An astronomer sees more in it than does a savage. God's self-manifestation is made to a sinful race and through a distorted medium; for man's reason is darkened and his will is warped. Hence few men see the full revelation of God in nature. St. Paul insists in his Epistle to the Romans that the Gentiles were inexcusable for not having known God as they should have known Him.

Divine Revelation is Supernatural when God reveals Himself, His existence or his attributes, not by a process of reasoning, but by means belonging to the supernatural order.

The first difference, therefore, between Divine Natural and Divine Supernatural Revelation depends on the difference in the character of the *means* employed in making the communication. The means through which Natural Revelation reaches us belong to the system of nature's forces as manifested in the ordinary operations of the material world or even of the mental world. On the other hand, the means through which Supernatural Revelation reaches us are miracles or such other exceptional means as may not, strictly speaking, constitute miracles, but which nevertheless go beyond the limits of ordinary Providence. Briefly, in the one case, the channel of revelation is nature; in the other it is grace. As is evident, the distinction between these two kinds of revelation will depend on what is meant by nature and what by grace. By nature we here mean not only the external, material, physical, sensible universe which is governed by fixed laws, but also the facts belonging to the mental and moral constitution of man, to the course of human history and to the proper government of human society. Understood in this broad sense, nature is the world of matter and the world of men; grace is all else.

The second difference between Natural and Supernatural Revelation depends on their *Extent* or *Compass*, that is, on the number, clearness and general character of the truths taught by each Revelation. They differ as the part differs from the whole, as the obscure

from clear, as the foundation from the entire structure. Hence they are not inconsistent. They are not opposed. They cannot be contrasted, as is sometimes asserted. Belief in the existence of God, which is a fundamental truth of natural religion, is also a fundamental truth in supernatural religion, and must be presupposed before we can accept any revelation as coming from God. Thus natural revelation lies at the basis of all religion, and supernatural revelation gladly welcomes and appropriates to itself all the light that comes from reason and all the truth that can be learned about God from any data furnished by nature. However, supernatural revelation teaches truth with greater clearness and certainty, and inculcates duties with greater emphasis. By its very nature, therefore, supernatural revelation was intended, not to destroy or even contradict, but to complete and supplement natural revelation. Also as the one is through grace and the other is through nature, and as both grace and nature are from the same God, it must be clear that all appearances of antagonism between them should entirely vanish.

The third difference between natural revelation and supernatural revelation depends on the different *Purpose* for which each is given. If man were destined for a natural end and lived in what theologians call the "State of Pure Nature," that is, without original sin and without either supernatural grace or the preternatural gifts that accompany such grace, natural revelation might suffice; for then man, through natural revelation, would receive from God, the Author of nature, all the knowledge needed for such an end.

But, in the present order of things, natural revelation is inadequate. Man is now destined to a supernatural end and needs supernatural knowledge to know how to reach that end. But supernatural knowledge can be obtained only by supernatural revelation. As is evident, natural revelation can throw no light on many questions of the utmost importance to men who have been elevated to a supernatural state, and who have forfeited all right to it by sin. Natural revelation cannot teach us such truths as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Grace, Sacrifices, Sacraments, continued personal existence after death, the proper form of Divine worship, or any of those Divine decrees that depend, not on the essence of God which is unchangeable, but on the will of God which, precisely because it is free, can be this, that or the other way. It cannot tell us so much as one word about God's readiness to pardon repented sin nor about the conditions for obtaining pardon. It cannot supply the knowledge that we need about God's moral attributes, such as His mercy, His Fatherly love, or His tender compassion for His erring children; but only about His metaphysical attributes, such

as His Unity, His Immensity, His Infinity, His Eternity. It does not show us the patient, merciful and helpful side of the Divine nature, neither does it give us so much as one glimpse into the grand scheme of grace by which, from all eternity, God had determined to save the human race by the death of Jesus Christ.

We have seen that such truths as the Trinity and the Incarnation can be known only by supernatural revelation, while certain others, such as the Existence and Unity of God, can be known by the natural light of reason. Now, the first and immediate purpose of supernatural revelation is to make the first class of truths known, simply known, and to make the second class better known, known more clearly and with greater certainty, and to give them the necessary Divine confirmation and authority.

The more remote purpose of supernatural revelation is the self-manifestation of God as the God of mercy, grace and love, and as the Redeemer of a fallen race from sin and its consequences. In another order of things, it is true, this purpose might have been different. For if man had never sinned redemption from sin could not have been one of the purposes of revelation. But even in the hypothesis that man had never sinned, the Incarnation, which is the greatest and most perfect manifestation of God, could and, according to the Scotists, would have taken place for even nobler ends than the redemption of the race. However that may be, certain it is that sin has increased man's ignorance and misery and made supernatural revelation more imperatively necessary than ever. What is specially needed, in our present fallen state, is the revelation that God is a God of infinite love, mercy and compassion, that He is a loving Father ever ready to pardon His repentant children, and that He is the Restorer of the entire human family to the state of original innocence and sanctity from which they had fallen by their "unutterably great sin."

That "God's mercies are above all His works," natural revelation may convey some vague hint, but can give no certain knowledge. It might, at most, suggest that God is possessed of a certain degree of mild benevolence; but it is only supernatural revelation that could ever have uttered the astonishing words, "God so loved the world as to give His Only-Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have everlasting life." Also that God is our Creator and Master, and that we are His servants, natural revelation may, indeed, make clear enough; but it is only supernatural revelation that could teach us that there exists a closer and dearer relationship between us and God, the relationship of children to a father. "You have not received the spirit of bondage again in fear; but you have received the spirit of adoption of children, whereby

we cry, Abba, Father. And if children, heirs also, heirs indeed of God and coheirs of Christ." (Romans, viii., 15.)

II. NATURAL REVELATION.

We know *that* God is and we know *what* He is, because He reveals Himself, His existence and His attributes through nature. St. Paul says that He was thus known to the Gentiles, and there is still stronger reason to believe that He was thus known to the early Hebrews and that some of this knowledge made its way into the Holy Scriptures.

We know that the visible world of matter and the invisible world of mind exist; because they reveal themselves by their activity. We learn from the science of Physics that nothing in nature is purely passive, but that all is also active. A stump or a stone, or any mass of apparently inanimate matter or inorganic substance is instinct with activity, and the molecules composing it, being forever in motion, thus make their presence known. As to the invisible spirits of our fellow-men, we know that they also exist, because through words and deeds and in other mysterious ways, which science fails adequately to explain, they make their presence felt to those around them, and so unmistakably felt that there can be no more doubt about the existence of the human soul than about the existence of the human body.

In a similar way God's existence is known. He exists; that we know, because He reveals Himself. In reality, it is not so much we who discover God as it is God who discovers Himself to us. St. Paul says: "That which is known of God is manifest to them (the Gentiles); for God manifested it to them." (Romans i., 19.) To the pagans, of whom St. Paul speaks, God manifested Himself, we may suppose, chiefly in the order and harmony that are everywhere evident in the world, and in the logical necessity for a First Cause of the world and of its continued existence. In each of these ways, and perhaps in other ways, the idea of God springs up in the mind under the suggestive power of the universe, requiring that some one should have created the world and continue to rule it. The idea is aroused by the play of thought in the action and reaction of reason on the external works of nature and of these on reason. There is something in the world of matter and in the world of men, something in the existence, in the forces, in the structure and in the movements of the grand universe in which we are placed that tends to originate and develop the notion of a Supreme Being in minds whose faculties are matured and in a normal condition. The Psalmist says: "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth forth work of His hands." (Psalm xix., 1.) And the

Apostle no less categorically affirms: "For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being perceived from the things that are made, also His eternal Power and Divinity, so that they are inexcusable." (Romans i., 20.)

The same arguments that prove *that* God is, prove also *what* He is. For the knowledge of His existence and the knowledge of His nature easily blend into one and become inseparable. Thus a due consideration of the world around us compels us to admit not only that God is, but also that He is Truth, Justice and Holiness; that He is self-existent, independent and superior to all limitations of time and place; that He is eternal in duration, ubiquitous in space, and unlimited in knowledge; that He is infinite in power, the source of all perfection, the ground of all truth, the Cause of all things, the Sustainer of all things, the Ruler of all things and the Judge of all men.

Now, all these Divine attributes, which could possibly have been derived from natural revelation, are abundantly found in nearly every book of Holy Writ. Just how far, as a matter of fact, such notions about God were originally developed by the natural light of reason, and how far they were supernaturally revealed before being committed to writing in Sacred Scripture, is now neither possible nor necessary to determine. All that is now contended is that Scripture contains many religious truths which, considering their very nature, could have been revealed through reason, and whose presence in Scripture can be amply justified by an appeal to reason. The following are a few among innumerable instances of *Speculative* truths about God:

"Thou, O Lord, in the beginning, didst lay the foundations of the earth,
And the heavens are the work of Thy hands.
They shall perish, but Thou shalt continue;
And they shall all grow old as a garment,
And as a vesture Thou shalt change them,
And they shall be changed.
But Thou art the self-same,
And Thy years shall not fail."

Psalm ci., 26; Hebrews i., 10-12.

"Whither shall I fly from Thy spirit?
Whither shall I go from Thy presence?
If I ascend into heaven, Thou art there;
If I descend into hell, Thou art there.
If I take unto me the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there shall Thy hand lead me;
And Thy right hand hold me . . .
Darkness shall not be dark to Thee,
And night be as light as the day."

Psalm cxxxviii., 7-12.

As to the *Practical* side of natural revelation, it is found in all classes of books. In the Pentateuch the most important ethical document is the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, which rise before us in majesty as the guide of morality to the Jewish Synagogue

and the Christian Church, and which though subsequently revealed in a supernatural manner to Moses, is in great part based on the ethical law of nature and cannot be abrogated, and is as binding now as it was when God thundered it forth from the summit of Mount Sinai. However, Biblical ethics abound especially in the "Wisdom Literature" of the Old Testament, which was intended to have a direct practical bearing on conduct. It starts, of course, with the assumption of God's existence, and seeks by reason and reflection to understand God's way of dealing with the world, and to determine man's duties towards God better than they are explained in the Law or the Prophets. These Sapien-tial Books consist largely of shrewd observations on the ways of the world; of maxims, the product of the sage's own experience; of proverbs, the result of meditation and reflection on the ever vary-ing phases of human life; and of practical advice, bearing on topics of domestic, social and civil affairs, on public policy and on the best means of getting on in the world. It has been said that this "wis-dom" seems at times to proceed on the assumption that such virtue as is here recommended is of the utilitarian kind and is to be culti-vated as a means to temporal happiness and worldly prosperity. "Honor the Lord with thy substance and thy barns shall be filled with abundance and thy wine presses shall run over with wine." (Prov. iii., 9.) But there is no question here of Christian ethics.

Some of the directions for regulating life and conduct, found in the Moral Books of the Old Testament, would seem to need even less supernatural revelation to make them known than the pre-ceding.

"Hear thou, my son, and be wise,
And guide thy mind in the way.
Be not at the feast of the wine-bibbers;
Among gluttonous eaters of flesh;
For the drunkard and the glutton shall be consumed;
And sleepiness shall clothe a man with rags."

Prov. xxiii., 19-21.

"Go to the ant, O Sluggard;
Consider her ways and be wise;
Who, having neither guide, nor master, nor captain,
Provideth her food in the summer,
And gathereth her meat in the harvest.
How long wilt thou sleep, O Sluggard?
When wilt thou rise out of thy sleep?
Thou wilt sleep a little,
Thou wilt slumber a little,
Thou wilt fold thy hands a little to sleep;
And want shall come upon thee as a robber,
And poverty as an armed man."

Prov. vi., 6-12.

"Correct thy son and he will give thee rest;
The rod and reproof give wisdom;
But the child that is left to his own will,
Bringeth his mother to shame."

Prov. xxix., 15.

III. SUPERNATURAL REVELATION.

While a very superficial glance at certain books of Holy Writ will enable us to infer that much of their contents could have been originally derived from natural reason, by what is called universal revelation, we should not forget that there are everywhere in Scripture indications which point as clearly to the fact that very considerable portions of some of the books are of such a nature that they could not have been known except by supernatural revelation from heaven. That we may recognize and appreciate properly this important element in the Bible, we shall consider the (1) *Form* in which it is given and examine some of its (2) *Contents*.

As we have seen, Natural Revelation is *Universal*, because it is common to all men, in so far as they are endowed with reason. Not so Supernatural Revelation. It is *Special*, because it was at first given to but a few chosen ones, such as Moses, or Isaiah, in order that they should communicate it to others and mediately to all. And this is the method that God usually employs, "to use the few to bless the many." We are told that, in the past, while communicating His mind to men, God used a marvellous variety of means, "In sundry manners and in divers ways." Accordingly we find that supernatural revelations have been made through *Nations*, through *Individuals*, through *Laws*, through *Miracles*, through *Doctrines*, through *Histories*, through *Types*, through *Prophecies*, through *Theophanies*, the last and the greatest of which is the *Incarnation*. Let us consider these various

(A) FORMS OF SUPERNATURAL REVELATION.

The one *Nation* that was chosen to be the channel of grace and the bearer of truth to all the other nations of the world was the Hebrew people. Both natural and supernatural methods were employed in their training. Secular and spiritual influences were exercised in their schooling, so as to bring them to the knowledge of God and His ways. The process of preparing them to be the bearers of light to the rest of the world was steadily and painfully carried on through thousands of years, and when at last "the fulness of time had come," it was among this extraordinary people that the brave men and noble women were found who were ready to receive the torch of truth that had been lighted among them and hand it on to others.

The *Individuals* chosen to be the channels of grace to the world were generally men of the same nationality, men of high moral character and exceptional religious acquirements, men whom God had specially prepared to be the instruments of His will. Sometimes, from a moral point of view, they had their faults; yet they were men whom God knew how to use as instruments of good for His gracious purpose.

But among them all One there was to whom grace was given without measure, "the Chosen One," "the Beloved One," "the Holy One of Israel," who was not so much the channel of revelation as He was its very source, Himself the most perfect revelation of God. But of Him, apart.

Sometimes a knowledge of God and His attributes was revealed through *Laws* promulgated in Scripture and imposed with a sanction, so as to make God known as a God of Justice and Righteousness, and as an object of obedience.

Sometimes a knowledge of God and His attributes was revealed through the *Miracles* related in Scripture; for miracles, which are extraordinary Divine facts happening in the realm of external nature, prove that God is so mighty that He can do as He pleases in His own creation and that He will do as He pleases, for higher providential reasons.

Sometimes a knowledge of God and His attributes was revealed in Scripture in the form of direct and explicit *Doctrinal Statement*. It is a great yet common mistake to suppose that there can be no supernatural revelation of Divine truths unless they are expressed in the dry-as-chaff technical language and in the abstract formulæ so much in vogue among the schoolmen. This style of language, of course, has its place and can be made to serve a good purpose; but it is seldom found in Scripture. Biblical Revelation is generally the statement of concrete facts. It is the unveiling of God, a personal, living Being. It is the disclosure of His transcendent moral excellences displayed in deeds. It is the gradual unfolding, in time and place, of the grand scheme of Redemption through Jesus Christ. Hence it is given largely in the form of History and Biography. Divine truth may, indeed, be communicated in abstract forms and expressed in general propositions; but these are usually deduced from the concrete facts related in Scripture. Therefore, once the reader has ceased to look for revealed truth in Scripture, expressed in the form usually employed in modern systematic theology, he will find that the sacred pages are full to repletion with such ideas.

Sometimes a knowledge of God and His attributes was revealed through the historical facts related in Scripture. Indeed, *History* is one of the principal vehicles through which a knowledge of the Divine truths has been transmitted to posterity. With the inspired writer the case was not always as it is with us. The facts which he has recorded may not have been revealed to him. He may have learned them from reliable sources of information, or he may have been an eye witness of many of them. If so, it is not that God has revealed the facts, but that the facts have revealed God. In our case, God has revealed the facts and the facts have revealed God.

To us, who did not know them otherwise, those facts have been supernaturally revealed by God through the pages of Holy Writ. Many of the historical facts of the Bible, having been brought about providentially by God Himself, are the means by which His wonderful dealings with His people have been made known to all who in any reliable way, natural or supernatural, have acquired a knowledge of those facts. By what He has done in all ages of the past to save His people, God has proved Himself to be a God of infinite love and mercy. Thus the tragical death of Christ on the Cross, with all its accompaniments, is a fact of history; but what an astonishing exhibition of the love of God for man!

The Old Testament History differs from all other histories, because it contains a preparatory dispensation leading up to a permanent covenant, that was to succeed in the distant future and to last to the end of time. St. Paul speaks of the Old Testament as the pedagogue that led the children of God, the Father of men, to Jesus Christ, the Teacher of men. "The Law was a pedagogue to Christ." (Gal. iii., 24.) Thus the New Testament grew out of the Old and realized all the sublimest ideals of that older dispensation.

The Old Testament History differs from all other histories in this also, that while they refer exclusively to the past, this contains a considerable element pointing unmistakably to the far-off future, either to the first or to the second Coming of the great Redeemer of the world and bearing on many events not to be realized till the close of the Book, till "the latter days."

Sometimes a knowledge of God and His attributes was revealed through the *Types* of the Old Testament. In this connection the word Type generally denotes a prophetic similitude, by means of which something that is to come to pass in the future is symbolized and foretold. It is essential that the resemblance between the type and the antitype should have been purposely intended by God, the Author of both. Now it is well known that much of the Old Testament God intended to be a type of the New, a foreshadowing of the good things to come. Many of the privileges that God conferred on the chosen people, much of the Legislation that He prescribed for their religious instruction and proper government, the peculiar relationship which they, as "a holy nation," bore towards God, together with many of the chief personages who held high office in Church or State in the Jewish Commonwealth, all foreshadowed something that was to be realized on a grander scale in the life and work or in the person and character of Jesus Christ, or in the Church which He was to establish.

Adam and Noah, Abraham and Melchisadeck, Sarah and Hagar, Isaac and Ishmael, Joseph and Joshua, David and Solomon, the

Ark of the Covenant and the Paschal Lamb, the Scape-Goat and the Brazen Serpent, the pillar of fire by night and the pillar of cloud by day, and the Shekina or visible Divine Presence resting on the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies in the Temple were all so many shadows of things to come in the distant future. In fact, St. Paul, in his Epistles to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, and to the Hebrews, explains the entire Aaronic Ritual, with all its ceremonies and sacrifices, as foreshadowing the realities of the future Church of Christ.

As almost any one of these types bears so many and so remarkable resemblances to their corresponding antitypes, that there can be no doubt that they were divinely intended, what shall we think when dozens of such types are found, consisting of persons, events, things or institutions and described with the greatest variety and complexity of detail, yet all foreshadowing their antitypes in the remote future? St. Paul says: "Now all these things happened to them in figure; and they were written for our correction, upon whom the ends of the world are come." (I. Cor. x., 11.) "Which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body (substance) is Christ's." (Coll. ii., 17.) "Which serve as a shadow of heavenly things." (Heb. viii., 5.) "Which things are said by an allegory." (Gal. iv., 24.)

Sometimes a knowledge of God and His attributes was revealed through the *Prophecies* of Scripture. Much of the future that is predicted in the Bible is foretold directly, and not through the intervention of type and figure. Those direct Prophecies were made at a time and under circumstances when there was no indication in the course of events that such predictions cannot be ascribed to the shrewd political forecast, to the happy conjecture, or to the mental acumen of the Prophet, but must have come supernaturally from God. Combined, these prophetic glimpses into futurity form a long series of prophecies which, when fulfilled, are converted into a record of ancient historical events of prime importance to the History of Religion. Since many of the predictions of the early Prophets of Israel referred to the fate that overtook most of the neighboring nations, their fulfillment ever impressed more and more on the Hebrew mind that their God was not a mere local or national Deity, but was the one Universal God, who regulates the destinies of nations as well as the fate of individuals.

Another series of direct prophecies refers to the gradual development of the Messianic Idea, to the future establishment of "the Kingdom of God," and to the Redemption of the whole human race through Him "who was to come." But of this later on.

Since many of these predictions referred to events that were to happen only in a remote future, and that were dependent on

many unforeseen contingencies, and on the free will of so many unknown men not yet born, and bore on matters that were beyond the reach of human sagacity, their fulfilment makes it clear that the Hebrew Prophet read the future in the light of "Him who knows the end from the beginning," and proves to every reflecting mind that this very considerable portion of the contents of Scripture is also Divine.

Sometimes a knowledge of God and of His attributes was revealed in the form of *Theophanies*. By Theophany is generally meant a sensible manifestation of God. Such manifestations have been made in a great variety of ways. Some have been made through an audible voice, as when God spoke to Adam, Abraham or the other Patriarchs; some through the "Angel of Jehovah;" some through the pillar of fire and of the cloud; some through the Shekina, or visible presence of God on the wings of the cherubim; some through visions and prophetic dreams; some through various other displays of the glory and majesty of God; but principally through the Incarnation, Birth, Baptism, Transfiguration, Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ.

The frequency of such apparitions and the distance in time and place at which they happened teach that God is not the mere local or national God of the Hebrews, but the God of all the earth; and that while He is so transcendent as to be above and beyond the universe, yet He is so immanent as to be everywhere present in the world—in it, but not of it. The Theophanies teach that God is not so far from any of us, and that, if we but reach out our hand to Him and feel after Him, we shall find Him.

If God is ubiquitous, if He is everywhere present in nature, if He pervades the universe, this truth could not have been more impressively taught than by these Theophanies, which prove, even to sense, that He is not so far off but that He can also be near, and a present help in time of need to all that call upon Him. "Thus saith the High and Lofty One who inhabiteth Eternity; the Holy One is His Name; I dwell in the Heights and in the Holy Place, and with those who are lowly and humble in spirit." (Isaiah lvii., 15.)

(B) CONTENTS OF SUPERNATURAL REVELATION.

Whatever else it may be, Scripture is a religious Book. To appreciate this statement at its proper value, we should know what is meant by religion. St. Thomas teaches that religion is a bond of union between God and man. It is, of course, a moral bond, because it exists between two intelligent and free beings, who are united by means of intelligence and free will. Now, the relation which religion establishes between God and man is the relation of

supreme dominion over man on the part of God and of absolute subjection to God on the part of man. In religion, then, there is an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God and of the dependence of man and a voluntary expression of that relationship in acts of worship. The first part of this complex act, which consists in a knowledge of certain speculative truths to be believed about God and man, belongs to the intellect and is Theoretical; the second part, which consists of certain resultant duties to be performed towards God, concerns the will and is Practical. Now Scripture contains much Theoretical and much Practical knowledge, supernaturally revealed, about God, about man and about the God-man, Jesus Christ, and about their mutual relations.

As to the *Speculative* Teachings of Scripture, God's character is everywhere described in a manner worthy of the Supreme Being. His Unity, His Eternity, His Infinity, His Immensity, His Personality, His Self-Existence, His Perfection, His Wisdom, His Inscrutable Will, His Fatherly Compassion, His all-embracing Love, His unlimited Divine Presence, His Truthfulness, His Almighty Power, His Awful Sanctity, His Mysterious Divine Life, and all the moral excellences of His Being are, on nearly every page of Holy Writ, again and again insisted upon in a tone calculated to win Him the admiration, the reverence, the obedience and the love of every rational creature.

In fact, Scripture is full of God. While inspiring it, He must have breathed Himself into it. Accordingly the Book has thoughts above every human thought. It contains truths that penetrate the soul and arouse it as no other truths can arouse it. To the sorrowful, to the repentant, to the afflicted, to the abandoned, to all that long for light, and strength, and grace to do what is right and avoid what is evil, Scripture speaks of God and speaks of Him in such a manner as to inspire a love of truth, justice and holiness.

"Thus saith the High and Lofty One who inhabiteth Eternity;
The Holy One is His Name;
I dwell in the Heights and in the Holy Place,
And with the contrite and the humble of spirit,
To revive the spirit of the humble,
And to revive the heart of the contrite."

Isaiah lvii., 15.

"He was a man of sorrow and acquainted with infirmity;
He was wounded for our iniquities,
He was bruised for our sins,
And by his stripes we are healed;
And the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all.
He was led like a lamb to the slaughter;
For the wickedness of my people have I struck him."

Isaiah liii., 6-8.

"How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts!
My soul longeth and fainteth for the courts of the Lord.
My heart and my flesh have rejoiced in the living God.

For the sparrow hath found herself a home,
 And the turtle dove a nest,
 Where she may lay her young.
 Thy altars, O Lord of Hosts, my King and my God.
 Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house.
 Blessed is the man whose help is in Thee.
 I would rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God
 Than dwell in the tabernacle of sinners.
 For God loveth mercy and truth;
 The Lord will give grace and glory.
 Upon the harp will I give thanks to Thee, O God, my God."
Psalm lxxxiv., 1-12.

These are not isolated instances of the pure and lofty worship in which the soul is brought face to face with God in this wonderful collection of songs. In fact, the Psalter is full to overflowing with passages that breathe forth the deepest homage of the heart for God. Thus is this book a fitting symbol of the fearful struggle of the soul for all that is worth having, a struggle lasting a lifetime, a struggle full of pitfalls and lapses, full of conversions and tears of repentance, yet crowned with victory in the end.

"Have mercy on me, O Lord;
 For I am alone and poor.
 Keep Thou my soul and deliver me.
 Show Thy ways to me and teach me Thy paths;
 For Thou art my Saviour.
 Wash me thoroughly from my sins,
 And cleanse me from my iniquity.
 Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.
 Turn away Thy face from my sins,
 And blot out my iniquities.
 Cast me not away from Thy face,
 And take not Thy holy Spirit from me."

Psalm l., 6-8.

While a former shepherd boy sat on the throne of Israel, the recollections of his early youth, when he lovingly and tenderly followed and fed his flock on the hills around Bethlehem, furnished him with beautiful metaphors for the most touching psalms.

"The Lord is my Shepherd;
 I shall want nothing.
 He hath made me to lie down in green pastures;
 He hath led me beside the restful waters.
 He hath brought me in the paths of justice
 For His Name's sake.
 Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death,
 I will fear no harm; for Thou art with me;
 And Thy mercy will follow me all the days of my life,
 And I shall dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

Psalm xxii.

As to *man*, nothing can be more noble than the speculative teachings of Scripture about his physical and moral nature. Man is represented as having been created immediately by God Himself; his body from the dust of the earth and his soul from the breath of God. Man was created after all other creatures, so as to show that he is the "Lord of the fowl and the brute," and that while all are subject to him, he is subject to God alone. He is also endowed with reason and free will to show that he must serve his Creator intelli-

gently and freely. He is adorned with grace and destined to a supernatural end, which consists in seeing God face to face in the Beatific Vision in heaven.

"What is man that Thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man that Thou didst visit him?
Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor,
And placed him over the works of Thy hands.
Thou hast put all things under his feet;
All sheep and oxen and the beasts of the field;
The birds of the air and fishes of the sea,
That pass through the paths of the sea,
Thou hast made him little lower than the angels."

Psalm viii., 5-9.

Finally, man having fallen from his high estate, a Redeemer is promised in the Old Testament and the completed work of Redemption is related in the New.

The *Practical* teachings of Scripture concerning man's duties to God, to himself, to his parents, to his neighbors and to society at large are so sublime, so profound, so perfect and so true to the majesty of God and so worthy of the exalted dignity of man that they must have been revealed by God Himself.

The Decalogue or Ten Commandments might be mentioned as a brief resume of our moral duties; for there, in a few words, our obligations, both negative and positive, are inculcated as is done in the code of no other ancient people. It is wonderfully well drafted. First come our duties towards God, then towards our parents, then towards our neighbors. As to the latter, the gradation should be noticed. A man's most precious blessing and the foundation of all the others is his life. His next greatest treasure in his wife. The next is his fortune. And finally his reputation. In the same order, murder, adultery, theft and calumny are forbidden. In what follows the gradation is no less remarkable and complete. For not only wicked deeds, but also wicked words are forbidden; and not only wicked words, but also wicked desires.

Elsewhere in Scripture our duties are described and insisted upon more in detail. We are told "to rise up before the gray head;" "to honor the person of the aged;" "to be honest in weight and measure;" and "to speak the truth every man to his neighbor." In the Gospels a higher order of morality is inculcated. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like unto this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt. xxii., 38.) "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; bless them that curse you; and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you; that you may be the children of your Father in heaven, who maketh His sun to rise upon the good and the bad, and raineth upon the just and the unjust; and

do unto others as you would that others should do unto you." (Matt. v., 44-46.)

Their civil and religious code imposed on the Hebrews the obligation of protecting the weak, the helpless and the downtrodden of every description. Nor can it be shown that the Constitution of any other people of antiquity takes so carefully into account the welfare of this class of persons as does the legislation of the Hebrews. For this reason it would be difficult to find in the code of any other people, unless borrowed from this, a law more humane and at the same time more Divine than the following: "Thou shalt not molest a stranger, neither shalt thou afflict a widow, or a fatherless child. (Ex. xxii., 22.) "The gleanings of thy olive tree, of thy harvest and of thy vineyard, thou shalt not return to take them, but thou shalt leave them for the stranger, and for the fatherless child, and for the widow." (Deut. xxiv., 20-22.)

A knowledge of God and of man and of their mutual relations was still further revealed through the *God-man*, whose life is related in the Holy Gospels. Jesus Christ is the Central Figure in history. Appearing on the border-line, where the two Testaments meet, the one pointing forward to Him and the other looking backward to Him, He filled both Prophet and Apostle with all the truth that they could contain and with more than they could impart. The Old Testament Revelation shines, but it shines, like the moon, with a borrowed light, with a light borrowed from Him. It is ever looking forward. It is ever approaching nearer and nearer to its source, and becoming more and more illumined by the light shining from Him. The golden age of the Old Testament Revelation was not in the past, as was the case with all other ancient nations, but in the future. It was the age in which the long expected Messiah was to be the light of the world. In fact, the Messianic idea is the golden thread that runs through the entire fabric of the Old Testament, warp and woof, and gives to it whatever beauty or value it possesses. Of a truth, the Old Testament existed for Him, and without Him it would never have existed. Somewhat unlike His mother, the Jewish Synagogue, who bore Him and then expired, the Old Testament is still pregnant with Christ. "*Lex gravida Christo.*" If you take Him out of the Old Testament, what remains? If you take Him out, what is the remainder worth? Worth as much as the figure without the reality; or the shadow without the substance; or the shell without the kernel. "For to Him all the Prophets give testimony." (Acts x., 43.) And not only the Prophets, but all the Laws, all the Doctrines, all the Types, all the Miracles, all the Histories, all the Ritual Observances, all the Theophanies, all the Teachings, both Theoretical and Practical, of the Old Testament lead up to Him, prepare the way for His

Coming, and, like converging rays of light, point to Him, who is the "Promised One," and are all absorbed in the sunshine of His blessed countenance. "For Christ is the end of the Law." (Rom. x., 4.)

Beginning with the vague prediction that the Saviour of the race was to be "the seed of the woman," the Old Testament Prophecies grow ever more and more definite as time rolls on. It was foretold that He was to be of the family of Abraham, then of Isaac, then of Jacob, then of the tribe of Judah, then of the royal line of David and Solomon, then of a Virgin; that He was to be born in Bethlehem and after seventy weeks of years; that He would be both a glorious and a suffering Messiah; and that He was to be Priest, and Prophet, and King, and more than man. These and many other circumstances regarding the life and character of the future Redeemer are described in all the beauty of poetic numbers, with all the magnificence of Oriental imagery and with an ever increasing accuracy of detail to the end. In fact, so clear, so itemized, so circumstantial are some of the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah, written about B. C. 700, that, if the verbs were uniformly expressed in the past tense, as they often are, the author would appear to have written, not a Prophecy, but a history and might be considered a fifth Evangelist.

Indeed, so thoroughly did the faith of the Hebrews in a Messiah fashion their character and arouse their hopes that, while other ancient nations have looked back to a golden age in a remote past, the Israelites alone have ever looked forward to a golden age in the future, when the great Deliverer, upon whose head are many benedictions, would arise from among their own brethren and rule the destinies of nations. And what is still more strange, so deep was the impression made on the minds of neighboring nations by these prophecies of the Jews that there prevailed throughout the Orient the expectation that a King was to be born who was destined to rule the world.

At length the fulness of time is come. The Messianic age arrives. The long delay is ended. Salvation is nigh. He is here. The rude outline, roughly drafted by Moses in the early chapters of Genesis, was filled out by successive Prophets, as by so many artists, till the life-colors glowed on the canvas and, at the appointed time, He "who was to come," He who was "the Expected of the nations," "the Desired of the eternal hills," "the End of the Law," and the realization of all the Old Testament ideals, drew aside the veil of prophecy and stood before the world in the human garb of the divine Rabbi of Nazareth.

Henceforth Revelation shall no more be given through Seer or Prophet. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, in times past, spoke to the fathers through the prophets, last of all, in

these days, hath spoken to us through His Son, . . . by whom also He made the world." (Hebrews i., 1-2.) The Logos, the Eternal Word, the Second Person of the Trinity, having revealed God through the Prophets of old, now becomes man Himself, and through this man He becomes the perfect revelation, the completed revelation, the final revelation of God to man, the revelation of grace, and love, and mercy, and righteousness, and redemption, the revelation which can never be surpassed or even equaled, the revelation of "God manifested in the flesh."

But how is it that Jesus Christ is the most perfect revelation of God? How is it that His deeds, even when not accompanied by words or other verbal expressions, are a revelation at all? The answer to these questions should not be difficult to grasp once the fact and the nature of the Incarnation of the Son of God are properly understood.

Jesus Christ is the only Being in whom the two natures, human and Divine, are combined in such a way as to form but one individual, one person, a person who is at the same time both God and man, God from all eternity, made man in time. For, without ceasing to be God, as He was from everlasting, the Logos, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, took to Himself a perfect human nature, consisting of soul and body, and thus began to be man. He clothed Himself in our nature as in a garment, to show us how we also should wear the same garb. He folded Himself in our nature, as in an external form or medium, through which He might become visible, tangible and accessible to us. By becoming man, He never ceased to be a Person, and the human nature never began to be a Person, but was, from the first moment of its existence, united to the Person of the Eternal Word.

This union between the human and the Divine in Jesus Christ is a personal or hypostatical union, like the union between the soul and body of man, a union so close as to make but one person of the two natures, one individual, one principle of action, one responsible agent. This union is so intimate that the person of the divine Word is the only person that remains, and He so dominates and directs the human nature in Christ as to become the only agent responsible for all the actions of Jesus Christ. Therefore, all that was ever said or done or thought by the man Jesus Christ was said or done or thought by the second person of the Trinity, who is at the same time both God and man. From this it follows that all the acts of the head, or of the hand, or of the heart, all the thoughts, desires, emotions and affections of the human soul of Christ were perfectly conformable to the mind of God. They were God's acts and thoughts, and they revealed God to the world. And because God

dwelt in Christ and made use of His human nature to communicate His own mind to men, it follows that to see Christ, to hear Christ, to be taught by Christ was the same as to see God, to hear God and to be taught by God. Thus it is that, while men looked upon the human countenance of Christ, and conversed with Him, and heard His human language, and observed His human mode of life, they were in direct communication with God Himself and were receiving Divine revelations through all that He said or did.

One necessary result of the Incarnation is that the intellect of Christ knows nothing but what is true, and the will of Christ loves nothing but what is good. Hence all that He says or does or wills is a supernatural revelation of the mind of God. If, then, Christ loved the poor, or forgave sinners, or dined with publicans, or drove the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, or cast out devils, or cursed the barren fig tree, or fasted whole days, or passed the night in prayer, or was present at a marriage feast, or obeyed the laws of the land, or commanded to give to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar, or allowed Himself to be called the Son of David, or the Son of man, or the Son of God, or sacrificed His life for others, the mere fact that He did such things is proof conclusive that it was at least lawful for Him to do them under the circumstances, and that we may imitate His example. Thus such deeds, even when not accompanied by words, are a revelation of the mind of God in our regard. His every act was a revelation of God.

Jesus Christ is the Person revealing, and the Person revealed, and the revelation itself. For though He revealed Himself by His words, yet He revealed Himself still more luminously by His works, by His example and by His whole life. And it is especially by His voluntary death on the Cross to save sinners that He has revealed Himself as the God of infinite justice and of infinite love and mercy. He revealed Himself more by what He did and by what He was, than by what He said. He is the perfect revelation. For no matter how well revelation may have been made through the prophets of old, all that is as nothing when compared with that more luminous revelation that flashed from the eyes, and beamed from the face, and welled up from the heart, and flowed from the lips of Him who is "the Way, the Truth and the Life," and "the Light of every man that cometh into the world." Augustine says: "Facta Verbi verba sunt." And Gregory adds: "Dominus et Salvator noster, . . . aliquando nos sermonibus, aliquando vero operibus admonet. Ipsa Ejus Facta Præcepta sunt; quia dum aliquid tacitus facit, quid agere debeamus, innotescit." Yet what we know about His life, His work and His character we learn from the Holy Gospels.

This statement is confirmed by Leo XIII. in one of his official

utterances. In his latest and noblest Encyclical "On Jesus Christ Our Redeemer," he says: "We beg all Christians throughout the world to strive all they can to know their Redeemer as He really is. . . . There is nothing more salutary than His law; there is nothing more Divine than His teaching. . . . You should look upon it as the chief part of your duty to engrave upon the minds of your people the true knowledge and the very image of Jesus Christ; to explain His Love, His Mercies, and His Teachings by your writings, and by your words, in Schools and Universities, and from the Pulpit, and wherever an opportunity is offered. . . . This devotion we should hand on to the New Century as a pledge of better times to come." Elsewhere in the same document he says: "The greatest of all misfortunes is never to have known Jesus Christ."

But where is this knowledge of Jesus Christ to be found? This question Leo XIII. answers very forcibly in his Encyclical "On the Study of Holy Scripture," where we read, "Nowhere is there anything more fully or more clearly expressed in regard to the Saviour of the world than is to be found in the entire range of the Bible." St. Jerome says: "To be ignorant of the Scriptures is to be ignorant of Jesus Christ." In its pages the Image of Jesus Christ stands out living and breathing and diffusing everywhere around consolation in trouble, encouragement to virtue and attraction to the love of God.

CHAS. J. GRANNAN.

Catholic University, Washington.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS, DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII., EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHIEPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS,

ALIOSQUE LOCORVM ORDINARIOS

PACEM ET COMMVNIONEM CVM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salvtem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

GRAVES de communi re oeconomica disceptationes, quae non una in gente iam dudum animorum labefactant concordiam, crebrescunt in dies calentque adeo, ut consilia ipsa hominum prudentiorum suspensa merito habeant et sollicita. Eas opinionum fallaciae, in genere philosophandi agendique late diffusae, invexere

primum. Tum nova, quae tulit aetas, artibus adiumenta, commeatum celeritas et adscita minuendae operae lucrisque augendis omne genus organa, contentionem acuerunt. Denique, locupletes inter ac proletarios, malis turbulentorum hominum studiis, concitato dissidio, eo res iam est deducta, ut civitates saepius agitatae motibus, magnis etiam videantur calamitatibus funestandae.

Nos quidem, pontificatu vix inito, probe animadvertimus quid civilis societas ex eo capite periclitaretur; officiique esse duximus catholicos monere palam, quantus in socialismi placitis lateret error, quantaque immineret inde perniciēs, non externis vitae bonis tantummodo, sed morum etiam probitati religiosaeque rei. Huc spectarunt litterae encyclicae "Quod Apostolici muneris," quas dedimus die XXVIII. decembris anno MDCCCLXXVIII.—Verum, periculis iis ingravescens maiorē quotidie cum damno privatim publice, iterum Nos eoque enixius ad providendum contendimus. Datisque similiter litteris "Rerum novarum," die XV. maii anno MDCCCXCI., de iuribus et officiis fuse diximus, quibus geminas civium classes, eorum qui rem et eorum qui operam conferunt, congruere inter se oporteret; simulque remedia ex evangelicis praescriptis monstravimus, quae ad tuendam iustitiae et religionis causam, et ad dimicationem omnem inter civitatis ordines dirimendam visa sunt in primis utilia.

Nec vero Nostra, Deo dante, irrita cessit fiducia. Siquidem vel ipsi qui a catholicis dissident, veritatis vi commoti, hoc tribuendum Ecclesiae professi sunt, quod ad omnes civitatis gradus se porrigat providentem, atque ad illos praecique qui misera in fortuna versantur. Satisque uberes ex documentis Nostri catholici percepere fructus. Nam inde non incitamenta solum viresque hauserunt ad coepta optima persequenda; sed lucem etiam mutuati sunt optatam, cuius beneficio huiusmodi disciplinae studia tutius ii quidem ac felicius insisterent. Hinc factum ut opinionum inter eos dissensiones, partim submotae sint, partim mollitae interquieverint. In actione vero, id consecutum est ut ad curandas proletariorum rationes, quibus praesertim locis magis erant afflictæ, non pauca sint constanti proposito vel nove inducta vel aucta utiliter; cuiusmodi sunt: ea ignaris oblata auxilia, quae vocant secretariatus populi; mensae ad ruricularum mutationes; consociationes, aliae ad suppetias mutuo ferendas, aliae ad necessitates ob infortunia levandas; opificum sodalitia; alia id genus et societatum et operum adiumenta.

Sic igitur, Ecclesiae auspiciis, quaedam inter catholicos tum coniunctio actionis tum institutorum providentia inita est in praesidium plebis, tam saepe non minus insidiis et periculis quam inopia et laboribus circumventae. Quae popularis beneficentiae ratio nullā quidem propria appellatione initio distinguere consuevit: *socialismi christiani*

nomen a nonnullis invecum et derivata ab eo haud immerito obsoleverunt. Eam deinde pluribus iure nominare placuit *actionem christianam popularem*. Est etiam ubi, qui tali rei dant operam, *sociales christiani* vocantur: alibi vero ipsa vocatur *democratia christiana*, ac *democratici christiani* qui eidem dediti; contra eam quam socialistae contendunt *democratiam socialem*. Iamvero e binis rei significandae modis postremo loco allatis, si non adeo primus, *sociales christiani*, alter certe, *democratia christiana*, apud bonos plures offensionem habet, quippe cui ambiguum quiddam et periculosum adhaerescere existiment. Ab hac enim appellatione metuunt, plus unâ de causa: videlicet, ne quo oblecto studio popularis civitas foveatur, vel ceteris politicis formis praeoptetur; ne ad plebis commoda, ceteris tamquam semotis rei publicae ordinibus, christianae religionis virtus coangustari videatur: ne denique sub fucato nomine quoddam lateat propositum legitimi cuiusvis imperii, civilis, sacri, detrectandi. Qua de re quum vulgo iam nimis et nonnumquam acriter disceptetur, monet conscientia officii ut controversiae modum imponamus, definientes quidnam sit a catholicis in hac re sentiendum: praeterea quaedam praescribere consilium est, quo amplior fiat ipsorum actio, multoque salubrior civitati eveniat.

Quid *democratia socialis* velit, quid velle *christianam* oporteat, incertum plane esse nequit. Altera enim, plus minusve intemperanter eam libeat profiteri, usque eo pravitate a multis compellitur, nihil ut quidquam supra humana reputet; corporis bona atque externa consecetur, in eisque captandis fruendis hominis beatitatem constituat. Hinc imperium penes plebem in civitate velint esse, ut, sublatis ordinum gradibus aequatisque civibus, ad bonorum etiam inter eos aequalitatem sit gressus: hinc ius dominii delendum; et quidquid fortunarum est singulis, ipsaque instrumenta vitae, communia habenda. At vero *democratia christiana*, eonimirum quod christiana dicitur, suo veluti fundamento, positae a divina fide principiis niti debet, infimorum sic prospiciens utilitatibus, ut animos ad sempiterna factos convenienter perficiat. Proinde nihil sit illi iustitiâ sanctius; ius potiundi possidendi iubeat esse integrum; dispares tueatur ordines, sane proprios bene constitutae civitatis; eam demum humano convictui velit formam atque indolem esse, qualem Deus auctor indidit. Liquet igitur *democratiae socialis* et *christianae* communionem esse nullam: eae nempe inter se differunt tantum, quantum socialismi secta et professio christianae legis.

Nefas autem sit christianae democratiae appellationem ad politica detorqueri. Quamquam enim *democratia*, ex ipsa notatione nominis usuque philosophorum, regimen indicat populare; attamen in re praesenti sic usurpanda est, ut, omni politica notione detracta, aliud nihil significatum praeferat, nisi hanc ipsam beneficam in populum

actionem christianam. Nam naturae et evangelii praecepta quia suo iure humanos casus excedunt, ea necesse est ex nullo civilis regiminis modo pendere; sed convenire cum quovis posse, modo ne honestati et iustitiae repugnet. Sunt ipsa igitur manentque a partium studiis variisque eventibus plane aliena: ut in qualibet demum rei publicae constitutione, possint cives ac debeant iisdem stare praeceptis, quibus iubentur Deum super omnia, proximos sicut se diligere. Haec perpetua Ecclesiae disciplina fuit; hac usi Romani Pontifices cum civitatibus egere semper, quocumque illae administrationis genere tenerentur. Quae quum sint ita, catholicorum mens atque actio, quae bono proletariorum promovendo studet, eo profecto spectare nequaquam potest, ut aliud prae alio regimen civitatis admet atque invehat.

Non dissimili modo a democratia christiana removendum est alterum illud offensionis caput: quod nimirum in commodis inferiorum ordinum curas sic collocet, ut superiores praeterire videatur; quorum tamen non minor est usus ad conservationem perfectionemque civitatis. Praecavet id christiana, quam nuper diximus, caritatis lex. Haec ad omnes omnino cuiusvis gradus homines patet complectendos, utpote unius eiusdemque familiae, eodem benignissimo editos Patre et redemptos Servatore, eandemque in hereditatem vocatos aeternam. Scilicet, quae est doctrina et admonitio Apostoli: "Unum corpus, et unus spiritus, sicut vocati estis in una spe vocationis vestrae. Unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptismum. Unus Deus et Pater omnium, qui est super omnes, et per omnia, et in omnibus nobis." (Ephes. iv., 4-6.) Quare propter nativam plebis cum ordinibus ceteris coniunctionem, eamque arctiorem ex christiana fraternitate, in eosdem certe influit quantacumque plebi adiutandae diligentia impenditur; eo vel magis quia ad exitum rei secundum plane decet ac necesse est ipsos in partem operae advocari, quod infra aperiemus.

Longe pariter absit, ut appellatione democratiae christianae propositum subdatur omnis abiiciendae obedientiae eosque aversandi qui legitime praesunt. Revereri eos qui pro suo quisque gradu in civitate praesunt, eisdemque iuste iubentibus obtemperare, lex aequae naturalis et christiana praecipit. Quod quidem ut homine eodemque christiano sit dignum, ex animo et officio praestari oportet, scilicet *propter conscientiam*, quemadmodum ipse monuit Apostolus, quum illud edixit: "Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit." (Rom. xiii., 1, 5.) Abhorret autem a professione christianae vitae, ut quis nolit iis subesse et parere, qui cum potestate in Ecclesia antecedunt: Episcopis in primis, quos, integrâ Pontificis Romani in universos auctoritate, "Spiritus Sanctus posuit regere Ecclesiam Dei, quam acquisivit sanguine suo." (Act xx., 28.) Iam qui secus

sentiat aut faciat, is enimvero gravissimum eiusdem Apostoli praeceptum oblitus convincitur: "Obedite praepositis vestris, et subiacete eis. Ipsi enim pervigilant, quasi rationem pro animabus vestris reddituri." (Hebr. xiii., 17.) Quae dicta permagni interest ut fideles universi alte sibi defigant in animis atque in omni vitae consuetudine perficere studeant: eademque sacrorum ministri diligentissime reputantes, non hortatione solum, sed maxime exemplo, ceteris persuadere ne intermittant.

His igitur revocatis capitibus rerum, quas ante hac per occasionem datâ operâ illustravimus, speramus fore ut quaevis de christianae democratiae nomine dissensio, omnisque de re, eo nomine significata, suspicio periculi iam deponatur. Et iure quidem speramus. Etenim, iis missis quorundam sententiis de huiusmodi democratiae christianae vi ac virtute, quae immoderatione aliqua vel errore non careant; certe nemo unus studium illud reprehenderit, quod, secundum naturalem divinamque legem, eo unice pertineat, ut qui vitam manu et arte sustentant, tolerabiliorem in statum adducantur, habeantque sensim quo sibi ipsi prospiciant; domi atque palam officia virtutum et religionis libere expleant; sentiant se non animantia sed homines, non ethnicos sed christianos esse; atque adeo ad *unum* illud *necessarium*, ad ultimum bonum, cui nati sumus, et facilius et studiosius nitantur. Iamvero hic finis, hoc opus eorum qui plebem christiano animo velint et opportune relevatam et a peste incolumem socialismi.

De officiis virtutum et religionis modo Nos mentionem consulto inieci-mus. Quorundam enim opinio est, quae in vulgus manat, *quaestionem socialem*, quam aiunt, *oeconomicam* esse tantummodo: quum contra verissimum sit, eam moralem in primis et religiosam esse, ob eandemque rem ex lege morum potissime et religionis iudicio dirimendam. Esto namque ut operam locantibus geminetur merces; esto ut contrahatur operi tempus; etiam annonae sit vilitas: atqui, si mercenarius eas audiat doctrinas, ut assolet, eisque utatur exemplis, quae ad exuendam Numinis reverentiam alliciant depravandosque mores, eius etiam labores ac rem necesse est dilabi. Periclitatione atque usu perspectum est, opifices plerosque anguste misereque vivere, qui, quamvis operam habeant brevioris spatio et uberiores mercede, corruptis tamen moribus nullâque religionis disciplina vivunt. Deme animis sensus, quos inserit et colit christiana sapientia; deme providentiam, modestiam, parsimoniam, patientiam ceterosque rectos naturae habitus: prosperitatem, etsi multum contendas, frustra persequare. Id plane est causae, cur catholicos homines inire coetus ad meliora plebi paranda, aliaque similiter instituta invehere Nos nunquam hortati sumus, quin pariter moneremus, ut haec religione auspice fierent eâque adiutrice et comite.

Videtur autem propensae huic catholicorum in proletarios voluntati eo maior tribuenda laus, quod in eodem campo explicatur, in quo constanter feliciterque, benigno afflatu Ecclesiae, actiosa caritatis certavit industria, accommodata ad tempora. Cuius quidem mutuae caritatis lege, legem iustitiae quasi perficiente, non sua solum iubemur cuique tribuere ac iure suo agentes non prohibere; verum etiam gratificari invicem, "non verbo, neque lingua, sed opere et veritate" (I. Ioann. iii., 18); memores quae Christus peramanter ad suos habuit: "Mandatum novum do vobis: ut diligatis invicem, sicut dilexi vos, ut et vos diligatis invicem. In hoc cognoscent omnes quia discipuli mei estis, si dilectionem habueritis ad invicem." (Ioann. xiii., 34-35.) Tale gratificandi studium, quamquam esse primum oportet de animorum bono non caduco sollicitum, praetermittere tamen haudquaquam debet quae usui sunt et adiumento vitae. Qua in re illud est memoratu dignum, Christum, sciscitantibus Baptistae discipulis: "Tu es qui venturus es, an alium expectamus?" demandati sibi inter homines muneris arguisse causam ex hoc caritatis capite, Isaiae excitatâ sententia: "Caeci vident, claudi ambulant, leprosi mundantur, surdi audiunt, mortui resurgunt, pauperes evangelizantur." (Matth. xi., 5.) Idemque de supremo iudicio ac de praemiis poenisque decernendis eloquens, professus est se singulari quadam respecturum ratione, qualem homines caritatem alter alteri adhibuissent. In quo Christi sermone id quidem admiratione non vacat, quemadmodum ille, partibus misericordiae solantis animos tacite omissis, externae tantum commemoravit officia, atque ea tamquam sibimetipsi impensa: "Esurivi, et dedistis mihi manducare; sitivi, et dedistis mihi bibere; hospes eram, et collegistis me; nudus, et cooperuistis me; infirmus, et visitastis me; in carcere eram, et venistis ad me." Ib. xxv., 35-36.)

Ad haec documenta caritatis utrâque ex parte, et animae et corporis bono, probandae, addidit Christus de se exempla, ut nemo ignorat, quam maxime insignia. In re praesenti sane suavissima est ad recolendum vox ea paterno corde emissa: "Misereor super turbam" (Marc. viii., 2), et par voluntas ope vel mirifica subveniendi: cuius miserationis praeconium extat: "Pertransiit benefaciendo et sanando omnes oppressos a diabolo." (Act x., 38.) Traditam ab eo caritatis disciplinam Apostoli primum sancte naviterque coluerunt; post illos qui christianam fidem amplexi sunt auctores fuerunt inveniendae variae institutorum copiae ad miseras hominum quaecumque urgeant, allevandas. Quae instituta, continuis incrementis provecta, christiani nominis partaeque inde humanitatis propria ac praeclara sunt ornamenta: ut ea integri iudicii homines satis admirari non queant, maxime quod tam sit proclive ut in sua quisque feratur commoda; aliena posthabeat.

Neque de eo numero bene factorum excipienda est erogatio stipis, eleemosynae causâ; ad quam illud pertinet Christi: "Quod superest, date eleemosynam." (Luc. xi., 41.) Hanc scilicet socialistae carpunt atque e medio sublatam volunt, utpote ingenitae homini nobilitati iniuriosam. At enim si ad evangelii praescripta (Matth. vi., 2-4), et christiano ritu fiat, illa quidem neque erogantium superbiam alit, neque affert accipientibus verecundiam. Tantum vero abest ut homini sit indecora, ut potius foveat societatem coniunctionis humanae, officiorum inter homines fovendo necessitudinem. Nemo quippe hominum est adeo locuples, qui nullius indigeat; nemo est egenus adeo, ut non alteri possit qua re prodesse: est id innatum, ut opem inter se homines et fidenter poscant et ferant benevole. Sic nempe iustitia et caritas inter se devinctae, aequo Christi mitique iure, humanae societatis compagem mire continent, ac membra singula ad proprium et commune bonum providenter adducunt.

Quod autem laboranti plebi non temporariis tantum subsidiis, sed constanti quadam institutorum ratione subveniatur, caritati pariter laudi vertendum est; certius enim firmitusque egentibus stabit. Eo amplius est in laude ponendum, velle eorum animos, qui exercent artes vel operas locant, sic ad parsimoniam providentiamque formari, ut ipsi sibi decursu aetatis, saltem ex parte consulant. Tale propositum, non modo locupletum in proletarios officium elevat, sed ipsos honestat proletarios; quos quidem dum excitat ad clementiorem sibi fortunam parandam, idem a periculis arcet et ab intemperantia coërcet cupiditatum, idemque ad virtutis cultum invitat. Tanta igitur quum sit utilitatis ac tam congruentis temporibus, dignum certe est in quo caritas bonorum alacris et prudens contendat.

Maneat igitur, studium istud catholicorum solandae erigendaeque plebis plane congruere cum Ecclesiae ingenio et perpetuis eiusdem exemplis optime respondere. Ea vero quae ad idconducant, utrum *actionis christianae popularis* nomine appellentur, an *democratiae christianae*, parvi admodum refert; si quidem impertita a Nobis documenta, quo par est obsequio, integra custodiantur. At refert magnopere ut, in tanti momenti re, una eademque sit catholicorum hominum mens, una eademque voluntas atque actio. Nec refert minus ut actio ipsa, multiplicatis hominum rerumque praesidiis, augeatur, amplificetur. Eorum praesertim advocanda est benigna opera, quibus et locus et census et ingenii animique cultura plus quiddam auctoritatis in civitate conciliant. Ista si desit opera, vix quidquam confici potest quod vere valeat ad quaesitas populares vitae utilitates. Sane ad id eo certius breviusque patebit iter, quo impensius multiplex praestantiorum civium efficientia conspiret. Ipsi autem considerent velimus non esse sibi in integro, infimorum curare sortem an negligere; sed officio prorsus teneri. Nec enim

suis quisque commodis tantum in civitate vivit, verum etiam communibus: ut, quod alii in summam communis boni conferre pro parte nequeant, largius conferant alii qui possint. Cuius quidem officii quantum sit pondus ipsa edocet acceptorum bonorum praestantia, quam consequatur necesse est restrictior ratio, summo reddenda largitori Deo. Id etiam monet malorum lues, quae, remedio non tempestive adhibito, in omnium ordinum perniciem est aliquando eruptura: ut nimirum qui calamitosae plebis negligat causam, ipse sibi et civitati faciat improvide. Quod si actio ista christiano more socialis late obtineat vigeatque sincera, nequaquam profecto fiet, ut cetera instituta, quae ex maiorum pietate ac providentia iam pridem extant et florent, vel exarescant vel novis institutis quasi absorpta deficient. Haec enim atque illa, utpote quae eodem consilio religionis et caritatis impulsa, neque re ipsa quidquam inter se pugnantia, commode quidem componi possunt et cohaerere tam apte, ut necessitatibus plebis periculisque quotidie gravioribus eo opportunis liceat, collatis benemerendi studiis, consulere. Res nempe clamat, vehementer clamat, audentibus animis opus esse viribusque coniunctis; quum sane nimis ampla aerumnarum seges observetur oculis, et perturbationum exitialium impendeant, maxime ab invalescente socialistarum vi, formidolosa discrimina. Callide illi in sinum invadunt civitatis: in occultorum conventuum tenebris ac palam in luce, qua voce qua scriptis, multitudinem seditione concitant; disciplinâ religionis abiecta, officia negligunt, nil nisi iura extollunt; ac turbas egentium quotidie frequentiores sollicitant, quae ob rerum angustias facilius deceptioni patent et ad errorem rapiuntur. Aequè de civitate ac de religione agitur res; utramque in suo tueri honore sanctum esse bonis omnibus debet.

Quae voluntatum consensio ut optato consistat, ab omnibus praeterea abstinendum est contentionis causis quae offendant animos et disiungant. Proinde in ephemeridum scriptis et concionibus popularibus sileant quaedam subtiliores neque ullius fere utilitatis quaestiones, quae quum ad expediendum non faciles sunt, tum etiam ad intelligendum vim aptam ingenii et non vulgare studium exposcunt. Sane humanum est, haerere in multis dubios et diversos diversa sentire: eos tamen qui verum ex animo persequantur addecet, in disputatione adhuc ancipiti, aequanimitatem servare ac modestiam mutuaque observantiam; ne scilicet, dissidentibus opinionibus, voluntates item dissideant. Quidquid vero, in causis quae dubitationem non respuant, opinari quis malit, animum sic semper gerat, ut Sedi Apostolicae dicto audiens esse velit religiosissime.

Atque ista catholicorum actio, qualiscumque est, ampliore quidem cum efficacitate procedet, si consociationes eorum omnes, salvo suo cuiusque iure, unâ eademque primaria vi dirigente et movente pro-

cesserint. Quas ipsis partes in Italia volumus praestat institutum illud, a *Congressibus coetibusque catholicis*, saepenumero a Nobis laudatum: cui et Decessor Noster et Nosmetipsi curam hanc demandavimus communis catholicorum actionis, auspicio et ductu sacrorum Antistitum, temperandae. Item porro fiat apud nationes ceteras, si quis usquam eiusmodi est praecipuus coetus, cui id negotii legitimo iure sit datum.

Iamvero in toto hoc rerum genere, quod cum Ecclesiae et plebis christianae rationibus omnino copulatur, apparet quid non elaborare debeant qui sacro munere fungantur, et quam variâ doctrinae, prudentiae, caritatis industria id possint. Prodire in populum in eoque salutariter versari opportunum esse, prout res sunt ac tempora, non semel Nobis, homines e clero allocutis, visum est affirmare. Saepius autem per litteras ad Episcopos aliosve sacri ordinis viros, etiam proximis annis (Ad Ministrum Generalem Ordinis Fratrum Minorum, die XXV. nov. an MDCCCLXXXVIII.), datas, hanc ipsam amantem populi providentiam collaudavimus, propriamque esse diximus utriusque ordinis clericorum. Qui tamen in eius officiis explendis caute admodum prudenterque faciant, ad similitudinem hominum sanctorum. Franciscus ille pauper et humilis, ille calamitosorum pater Vincentius a Paulo, alii in omni Ecclesiae memoria complures, assiduas curas in populum sic temperare consueverunt, ut non plus aequo distenti neque immemores sui, contentione pari suum ipsi animum ad perfectionem virtutis omnis excolerent. Unum hic libet paulo expressius subiicere, in quo non modo sacrorum administri, sed etiam quotquot sunt popularis causae studiosi, optime de ipsa, nec difficili opera, mereantur. Nempe, si pariter studeant per opportunitatem haec praecipue in plebis anima fraterno alloquio inculcare. Quae sunt: a seditione, a seditiosis usquequaque caveant; aliena cuiusvis iura habeant inviolata; iustam dominis observantiam atque operam volentes exhibeant; domesticae vitae ne fastidiant consuetudinem multis modis frugiferam; religionem in primis colant, ab eaque in asperitatibus vitae certum petant solatium. Quibus perficiendis propositis sane quanto sit adiumento vel Sanctae Familiae Nazarethanae praestantissimum revocare specimen et commendare praesidium, vel eorum proponere exempla quos ad virtutis fastigium tenuitas ipsa sortis eduxit, vel etiam spem alere praemii in potiore vita mansuri.

Postremo id rursus graviusque commonemus, ut quidquid consilii in eadem causa vel singuli vel consociati homines efficiendum suscipiant, meminerint Episcoporum auctoritati esse penitus obsequendum. Decipi se ne sinant vehementiore quodam caritatis studio; quod quidem, si quam iacturam debitae obtemperationis suadeat, sincerum non est, neque solidae utilitatis efficiens, neque gratum

Deo. Eorum Deus delectatur animo qui, sententiâ sua postposita, Ecclesiae praesides sic plane ut ipsum audiunt iubentes; iis volens adest vel arduas molientibus res, coeptaque ad exitus optatos solet benignus perducere. Ad haec accedant consentanea virtutis exempla, maxime quae christianum hominem probant osorem ignaviae et voluptatum, de rerum copia in alienas utilitates amice impertientem, ad aerumnas constantem, invictum. Ista quippe exempla vim habent magnam ad salutare spiritus in populo excitandos; vimque habent maiorem, quum praestantiorum civium vitam exornant.

Haec vos, Venerabiles Fratres, opportune ad hominum locorumque necessitates, pro prudentia et navitate vestra curetis hortamur; de iisdemque rebus consilia inter vos, de more congressi, communicetis. In eo autem vestrae evigilent curae atque auctoritas valeat, moderando, cohibendo, obsistendo, ut ne, ullâ cuiusvis specie boni fovendi, sacrae disciplinae laxetur vigor, neu perturbetur ordinis ratio quem Christus Ecclesiae suae praefinivit. Recta igitur et concordia et progrediente catholicorum omnium operâ, eo pateat illustrius, tranquillitatem ordinis veramque prosperitatem in populis praecipue florere, moderatrice et faultrice Ecclesia; cuius est sanctissimum munus, sui quemque officii ex christianis praeceptis admonere, locupletes ac tenues fraterna caritate coniungere, erigere et roborare animos in cursu humanarum rerum adverso.

Praescripta et optata Nostra confirmet ea beati Pauli ad Romanos, plena apostolicae caritatis, hortatio: "Obsecro vos. . . . Reformamini in novitate sensus vestri. . . . Qui tribuit, in simplicitate; qui praeest, in sollicitudine; qui miseretur, in hilaritate. Dilectio sine simulatione. Odientes malum, adhaerentes bono: Caritate fraternitatis invicem diligentes; honore invicem praevenientes: Sollicitudine non pigri: Spe gaudentes; in tribulatione patientes; orationi instantes: Necessitatibus sanctorum communicantes; hospitalitatem sectantes. Gaudere cum gaudentibus, flere cum flentibus: Idipsum invicem sentientes: Nulli malum pro malo red dentes: Providentes bona non tantum coram Deo, sed etiam coram omnibus hominibus." (xii., 1-17.)

Quorum auspex bonorum accedat Apostolica benedictio, quam vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, Clero ac populo vestro amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die XVIII. ianuarii anno MDCCCXI, Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo tertio.

LEO PP. XIII.

APOSTOLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER LEO
XIII., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND
OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION
WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brothers, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

THE grave discussions on economical questions which for some time past have disturbed the peace of several countries of the world are growing in frequency and intensity to such a degree that the minds of thoughtful men are filled, and rightly so, with worry and alarm. These discussions take their rise in the bad philosophical and ethical teaching which is now widespread among the people. The changes also which the mechanical inventions of the age have introduced, the rapidity of communication between places and the devices of every kind for diminishing labor and increasing gain all add bitterness to the strife; and lastly matters have been brought to such a pass by the struggle between capital and labor, fomented as it is by professional agitators, that the countries where these disturbances most frequently occur find themselves confronted with ruin and disaster.

At the very beginning of our Pontificate we clearly pointed out what the peril was which confronted Society on this head, and we deemed it our duty to warn Catholics, in unmistakable language, how great the error was which was lurking in the utterances of Socialism, and how great the danger was that threatened not only their temporal possessions, but also their morality and religion. That was the purpose of our Encyclical Letter *Quod Apostolici Muneris*, which we published on the 18th of December, in the year 1878; but as these dangers day by day threatened still greater disaster, both to individuals and the Commonwealth, we strove with all the more energy to avert them. This was the object of our Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of the 15th May, 1891, in which we dwelt at length on the rights and duties which both classes of Society—those namely, who control capital, and those who contribute labor—are bound in relation to each other; and at the same time we made it evident that the remedies which are most useful to protect the cause of religion, and to terminate the contest between the different classes of Society, were to be found in the precepts of the Gospel.

Nor, with God's grace, were our hopes entirely frustrated. Even

those who are not Catholics, moved by the power of truth, avowed that the Church must be credited with a watchful care over all classes of Society, and especially those whom fortune had least favored. Catholics, of course, profited abundantly by these letters, for they not only received encouragement and strength for the admirable enterprises in which they were engaged, but also obtained the light they desired, by the help of which they were able with greater safety and with more plentiful blessings to continue the efforts which they had been making in the matter of which we are now speaking. Hence it happened that the differences of opinion which prevailed among them were either removed or their acrimony diminished and the discussion laid aside. In the work which they had undertaken this was effected, viz.: that in their efforts for the elevation of the poorer classes, especially in those places where the trouble is greatest, many new enterprises were set on foot; those which were already established were increased and all reaped the blessing of a greater stability imparted to them. Some of these works were called *Bureaus of the People*, their object being to supply information. Rural Savings Banks had been established, and various associations, some for mutual aid, others, of relief, were organized. There were Working Men's Societies and other enterprises for work or beneficence. Thus under the auspices of the Church, united action of Catholics was secured as well as wise discrimination exercised in the distribution of help for the poor who are often as badly dealt with by chicanery and exploitation of their necessities as they are oppressed by indigence and toil. These schemes of popular benevolence were, at first, distinguished by no particular appellation. The name of *Christian Socialism* with its derivatives which was adopted by some was very properly allowed to fall into disuse. Afterwards some asked to have it called *The Popular Christian Movement*. In the countries most concerned with this matter there are some who are known as *Christian Socialists*. Elsewhere the movement is described as *Christian Democracy*, and its partisans *Christian Democrats*, in contradistinction to those who are designated as *Socialists*, and whose system is known as *Social Democracy*. Not much exception is taken to the former, i. e., *Christian Socialism*, but many excellent men find the term *Christian Democracy* objectionable. They hold it to be very ambiguous, and for this reason open to two objections. It seems by implication to covertly favor popular government, and to disparage other methods of political administration. Secondly, it appears to belittle religion by restricting its scope to the care of the poor, as if the other sections of Society were not of its concern. More than that, under the shadow of its name there might easily lurk a design to attack all legitimate power, either civil or

sacred. Wherefore, since this discussion is now so widespread, so exaggerated and so bitter, the consciousness of duty warns us to put a check on this controversy and to define what Catholics are to think on this matter. We also propose to describe how the movement may extend its scope and be made more useful to the Commonwealth.

What *Social Democracy* is and what *Christian Democracy* ought to be, assuredly no one can doubt. The first, with due consideration to the greater or less intemperance of its utterance, is carried to such an excess by many as to maintain that there is really nothing existing above the natural order of things, and that the acquirement and enjoyment of corporal and external goods constitute man's happiness. It aims at putting all government in the hands of the people, reducing all ranks to the same level, abolishing all distinction of class, and finally introducing community of goods. Hence, the right of ownership is to be abrogated, and whatever property a man possesses, or whatever means of livelihood he has, is to be common to all.

As against this, *Christian Democracy*, by the fact that it is Christian, is built, and necessarily so, on the basic principles of Divine Faith, and provides for the betterment of the masses, with the ulterior object of availing itself of the occasion to fashion their minds for things which are everlasting. Hence, for *Christian Democracy* justice is sacred; it must maintain that the right of acquiring and possessing property cannot be impugned, and it must safeguard the various distinctions and degrees which are indispensable in every well-ordered Commonwealth. Finally it must endeavor to preserve in every human society the form and the character which God ever impresses on it. It is clear, therefore, that there is nothing in common between *Social* and *Christian Democracy*. They differ from each other as much as the sect of Socialism differs from the profession of Christianity.

Moreover, it would be a crime to distort this name of *Christian Democracy* to politics, for although democracy, both in its philological and philosophical significations, implies popular government, yet in its present application it is to be employed that, removing from it all political significance, it is to mean nothing else than a benevolent and Christian movement in behalf of the people. For the laws of nature and of the Gospel, which by right are superior to all human contingencies, are necessarily independent of all modifications of civil government, while at the same time they are in concord with everything that is not repugnant to morality and justice. They are, therefore, and they must remain absolutely free from political parties, and have nothing to do with the various changes of admin-

istration which may occur in a nation; so that Catholics may and ought to be citizens according to the constitution of any State, guided as they are by those laws which command them to love God above all things, and their neighbors as themselves. This has always been the discipline of the Church. The Roman Pontiffs acted upon this principle whenever they dealt with different countries, no matter what might be the character of their governments. Hence, the mind and the action of Catholics who are devoted to the amelioration of the working classes can never be actuated with the purpose of favoring and introducing one government in place of another.

In the same manner, from *Christian Democracy*, we must remove another possible subject of reproach, namely: that while looking after the advantage of the working people they should act in such a manner as to forget the upper classes of Society; for they also are of the greatest use in preserving and perfecting the Commonwealth. As we have explained, the Christian law of charity will prevent us from so doing. For it extends to all classes of Society, and all should be treated as members of the same family, as children of the same Heavenly Father, as redeemed by the same Saviour, and called to the same eternal heritage. Hence the doctrine of the Apostle who warns us that: "we are one body and one spirit called to the one hope in our vocation; one Lord, one Faith and one Baptism; one God and the Father of all who is above all, and through all, and in us all." Wherefore on account of the nature of the union which exists between the different classes of Society and which Christian brotherhood makes still closer, it follows that no matter how great our devotion may be in helping the people, we should all the more keep our hold upon the upper classes, because association with them is proper and necessary, as we shall explain later on, for the happy issue of the work in which we are engaged.

Let there be no question of fostering under this name of *Christian Democracy* any intention of diminishing the spirit of obedience, or of withdrawing people from their lawful rulers. Both the natural and the Christian law command us to revere those who, in their various grades, are above us in the State, and to submit ourselves to their just commands. It is quite in keeping with our dignity as men and Christians to obey, not only exteriorly, but from the heart, as the Apostle expresses it, *for conscience' sake*, when he commands us to keep our soul subject to the higher powers. It is abhorrent to the profession of a Christian for any one to be unwilling to be subject and obedient to those who rule in the Church, and first of all to the bishops whom (without prejudice to the universal power of the Roman Pontiff) "the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of

God which Christ has purchased by His blood." (Acts xx., 28.) He who thinks or acts otherwise is guilty of ignoring the grave precept of the Apostle who bids us to obey our rulers and to be subject to them, for they watch, having to give an account of our souls. Let the faithful everywhere implant these principles deep in their souls, and put them in practice in their daily life, and let the ministers of the Gospel meditate them profoundly, and incessantly labor not merely by exhortation but especially by example to make them enter into the souls of others.

We have recalled these matters which on other occasions we have made the subject of our instructions, in the hope that all dissension about the name of *Christian Democracy* will cease and that all suspicion of any danger coming from what the name signifies will be put at rest. And with reason do we hope so; for neglecting the opinions of certain men, with regard to the power and the efficacy of this kind of *Christian Democracy*, which at times are exaggerated and are not free from error, let no one, however, condemn that zeal which, according to the natural and Divine law, has this for its object, viz.: to make the condition of those who toil more tolerable; to enable them to obtain, little by little, those means by which they may provide for the future; to help them to practice in public and in private the duties which morality and religion inculcate; to aid them to feel that they are not animals but men, not heathens but Christians, and so to enable them to strive more zealously and more eagerly for the one thing which is necessary, viz.: that ultimate good for which we are all born into this world. This is the intention; this is the work of those who wish that the people should be animated by Christian sentiments and should be protected from the contamination of Socialism which threatens them.

We have designedly made mention here of virtue and religion. For, it is the opinion of some, and the error is already very common, that the social question is merely an economic one, whereas in point of fact, it is above all a moral and religious matter, and for that reason must be settled by the principles of morality and according to the dictates of religion. For even though wages are doubled and the hours of labor are shortened and food is cheapened, yet if the workingman hearkens to the doctrines that are taught on this subject, as he is prone to do, and is prompted by the examples set before him to throw off respect for God and to enter upon a life of immorality, his labors and his gain will avail him naught.

Trial and experience have made it abundantly clear that many a workman lives in cramped and miserable quarters, in spite of his shorter hours and larger wages, simply because he has cast aside the restraints of morality and religion. Take away the instinct which

Christian virtue has planted and nurtured in men's hearts, take away prudence, temperance, frugality, patience and other correct natural habits, no matter how much he may strive, he will never achieve prosperity. That is the reason why we have incessantly exhorted Catholics to enter these associations for bettering the condition of the laboring classes, and to organize other undertakings with the same object in view; but we have likewise warned them that all this should be done under the auspices of religion, with its help and under its guidance.

The zeal of Catholics on behalf of the masses is especially noteworthy by the fact that it is engaged in the very field in which, under the benign inspiration of the Church, the active industry of charity has always labored, adapting itself in all cases to the varying exigencies of the times. For the law of mutual charity perfects, as it were, the law of justice, not merely by giving each man his due and in not impeding him in the exercise of his rights, but also by befriending him in case of need, "not with the word alone, or the lips, but in deed and in truth;" being mindful of what Christ so lovingly said of His own: "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you, that you love also one another. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for the other." This zeal in coming to the rescue of our fellow-men should, of course, be solicitous, first for the imperishable good of the soul, but it must not neglect what is necessary and helpful for the body.

We should remember what Christ said to the disciples of the Baptist who asked him: "Art thou he that art to come or look we for another?" He invoked, as the proof of the mission given to Him among men, His exercise of charity, quoting for them the text of Isaias: "The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the Gospel preached to them." (Matth. xi., 5.) And speaking also of the last judgment and of the rewards and punishments He will assign, He declared that He would take special account of the charity men exercised towards each other. And in that discourse there is one thing that especially excites our surprise, viz.: that Christ omits those works of mercy which comfort the soul and refers only to external works which, although done in behalf of men, He regards as being done to Himself. "For I was hungry and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; naked and you covered Me; sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to Me." (Matth. xxv., 35.)

To the teachings which enjoin the twofold charity of spiritual and corporal works, Christ adds His own example so that no one may

fail to recognize the importance which He attaches to it. In the present instance we recall the sweet words that came from His paternal heart: "I have pity on the multitude" (Mark vii., 2), as well as the desire He had to assist them even if it were necessary to invoke His miraculous power. Of His tender compassion we have the proclamation made in Holy Writ, viz.: that "He went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil." (Acts x., 38.) This law of charity which He imposed upon His apostles, they in the most holy and zealous way put into practice; and after them those who embraced Christianity originated that wonderful variety of institutions for alleviating all the miseries by which mankind is afflicted. And these institutions carried on and continually increased their powers of relief and were the especial glories of Christianity and of the civilization of which it was the source, so that right-minded men never fail to admire those foundations, aware as they are of the proneness of men to concern themselves about their own and neglect the needs of others.

Nor are we to eliminate from the list of good works the giving of money for charity, in pursuance of what Christ has said: "But yet that which remaineth, give alms." (Luke xi., 41.) Against this, the Socialist cries out and demands its abolition as injurious to the native dignity of man. But if it is done in the manner which the Scripture enjoins (Matth. vi., 2), and in conformity with the true Christian spirit, it neither connotes pride in the giver or inflicts shame upon the one who receives. Far from being dishonorable for man it draws closer the bonds of human society by augmenting the force of the obligation of the duties which men are under with regard to each other. No one is so rich that he does not need another's help; no one so poor as not to be useful in some way to his fellow-man; and the disposition to ask assistance from others with confidence, and to grant it with kindness is part of our very nature. Thus justice and charity are so linked with each other, under the equable and sweet law of Christ, as to form an admirable cohesive power in human society and to lead all of its members to exercise a sort of providence in looking after their own and in seeking the common good as well.

As regards not merely the temporary aid given to the laboring classes, but the establishment of permanent institutions in their behalf, it is most commendable for charity to undertake them. It will thus see that more certain and more reliable means of assistance will be afforded to the necessitous. That kind of help is especially worthy of recognition which forms the minds of mechanics and laborers to thrift and foresight so that in course of time they may be able, in part at least, to look out for themselves. To aim at that is

not only to dignify the duty of the rich towards the poor, but to elevate the poor themselves; for while it urges them to work for a better degree of comfort in their manner of living, it preserves them meantime from danger by checking extravagance in their desires, and acts as a spur in the practice of the virtues proper to their state. Since, therefore, this is of such great avail and so much in keeping with the spirit of the times, it is a worthy object for charity to undertake with all prudence and zeal.

Let it be understood, therefore, that this devotion of Catholics to comfort and elevate the mass of the people is in keeping with the spirit of the Church and is most conformable to the examples which the Church has always held up for imitation. It matters very little whether it goes under the name of "*The Popular Christian Movement*," or "*Christian Democracy*," if the instructions that have been given by Us be fully carried out with the submission that is due. But it is of the greatest importance that Catholics should be one in mind, will and action in a matter of such great moment. And it is also of importance that the influence of these undertakings should be extended by the multiplication of men and means devoted to the same object.

Especially must there be appeals to the kindly assistance of those whose rank, worldly wealth and culture give them importance in the community. If their help is excluded, scarcely anything can be done which will be of any assistance for the wants which now clamor for satisfaction in this matter of the well-being of the people. Assuredly the more earnestly many of those who are prominent in the State conspire effectively to attain that object the quicker and surer will the end be reached. We wish them to understand that they are not at all free to look after or neglect those who happen to be beneath them, but that it is a strict duty which binds them. For no one lives only for his personal advantage in a community; he lives for the common good as well, so that when others cannot contribute their share for the general object, those who can do so are obliged to make up the deficiency. The very extent of the benefits they have received increases the burden of their responsibility, and a stricter account will have to be rendered to God who bestowed those blessings upon them. What should also urge all to the fulfillment of their duty in this regard is the widespread disaster which will eventually fall upon all classes of Society if this assistance does not arrive in time; and therefore is it that he who neglects the cause of the distressed poor is not doing his duty to himself or to the State.

If this social movement extends its scope far and wide in a true Christian fashion, and grows in its proper and genuine spirit, there will be no danger, as is feared, that those other institutions, which

the piety of our ancestors have established and which are now flourishing, will decline or be absorbed by new foundations. Both of them spring from the same root of charity and religion, and not only do not conflict with each other, but can be made to coalesce and combine so perfectly as to provide by a union of their benevolent resources in a more efficacious manner against the graver perils and necessities of the people which confront us to-day.

The condition of things at present proclaims, and proclaims vehemently, that there is need for a union of brave minds with all the resources they can command. The harvest of misery is before our eyes, and the dreadful projects of the most disastrous national upheavals are threatening us from the growing power of the socialistic movement. They have insidiously worked their way into the very heart of the State, and in the darkness of their secret gatherings, and in the open light of day, in their writings and their harangues, they are urging the masses onward to sedition; they fling aside religious discipline, they scorn duties and clamor only for rights; they are working incessantly on the multitudes of the needy which daily grow greater, and which, because of their poverty, are easily deluded and hurried off into ways that are evil. It is equally the concern of the State and of Religion, and all good men should deem it a sacred duty to preserve and guard both in the honor which is their due.

That this most desirable agreement of wills should be maintained, it is essential that all refrain from giving any causes of dissension in hurting and alienating the minds of others. Hence in newspapers and in speeches to the people, let them avoid subtle and useless questions which are neither easy to solve nor to understand except by minds of unusual ability and only after the most serious study. It is quite natural for people to think differently in doubtful questions, but those who address themselves to these subjects in a proper spirit will preserve their mental calm and not forget the respect which is due to those who differ from them. If minds see things in another light it is not necessary to become alienated forthwith. To whatever opinion a man's judgment may incline, if the matter is yet open to discussion, let him keep it, provided his mental attitude is such that he is ready to yield if the Holy See should otherwise decide.

This Catholic action, of whatever description it may be, will work with greater effect if all of the various associations, while preserving their individual rights, move together under one primary and directive force.

In Italy we desire that this directive force should emanate from the Catholic Congresses and Reunions so often praised by us, to further which our predecessor and we ourselves have ordered that these meetings should be controlled and guided by the Bishops of

the country. So let it be for other nations, in case there be any leading organization of this description to which this matter has been legitimately entrusted.

Now in all questions of this sort where the interests of the Church and the Christian people are so closely allied, it is evident what they who are in the sacred ministry should do, and it is clear how industrious they should be in inculcating right doctrine and in teaching the duties of prudence and charity. To go out and move among the people, to exert a healthy influence on them by adapting themselves to the present condition of things is what more than once in addressing the clergy we have advised. More frequently also in writing to the Bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, and especially of late (to the Minister General of the Minorites, November 25, 1898,) we have lauded this affectionate solicitude for the people and declared it to be the especial duty of both the secular and regular clergy. But in the fulfillment of this obligation let there be the greatest caution and prudence exerted, and let it be done after the fashion of the saints. Francis, who was poor and humble, Vincent of Paul, the Father of the afflicted classes, and very many others whom the Church keeps ever in her memory, were wont to lavish their care upon the people, but in such wise as not to be engrossed overmuch or to be unmindful of themselves or to let it prevent them from laboring with the same assiduity in the perfection of their own soul and the cultivation of virtue.

There remains one thing upon which we desire to insist very strongly, in which not only the ministers of the Gospel, but also all those who are devoting themselves to the cause of the people, can with very little difficulty bring about a most commendable result. That is to inculcate in the minds of the people, in a brotherly way and whenever the opportunity presents itself, the following principles, viz.: to keep aloof on all occasions from seditious acts and seditious men; to guard inviolate the rights of others; to show a proper respect to superiors; to willingly perform the work in which they are employed; not to grow weary of the restraint of family life which in many ways is so advantageous; to keep to their religious practices above all, and in their hardships and trials to have recourse to the Church for consolation. In the furtherance of all this, it is very efficacious to propose the splendid example of the Holy Family of Nazareth, and to advise the invocation of its protection, and it also helps to remind the people of the examples of sanctity which have shone in the midst of poverty, and to hold up before them the reward that awaits them in the better life to come.

Finally we recur again to what we have already declared and we insist upon it most solemnly, viz.: that whatever projects individuals

or associations form in this matter should be done with due regard to Episcopal authority and absolutely under Episcopal guidance. Let them not be led astray by an excessive zeal in the cause of charity. If it leads them to be wanting in proper submission it is not a sincere zeal; it will not have any useful result and cannot be acceptable to God. God delights in the souls of those who put aside their own designs and obey the rulers of His Church as if they were obeying Him; He assists them even when they attempt difficult things and benignly leads them to their desired end. Let them show also examples of virtue, so as to prove that a Christian is a hater of idleness and indulgence, that he gives willingly from his goods for the help of others, and that he stands firm and unconquered in the midst of adversity. Examples of that kind have a power of moving people to dispositions of soul that make for salvation, and have all the greater force as the condition of those who give them is higher in the social scale.

We exhort you, Venerable Brethren, to provide for all this, as the necessities of men and of places may require, according to your prudence and your zeal, meeting as usual in council to combine with each other in your plans for the furtherance of these projects. Let your solicitude watch and let your authority be effective in controlling, compelling, and also in preventing, lest any one under the pretext of good should cause the vigor of sacred discipline to be relaxed or the order which Christ has established in His Church to be disturbed. Thus by the correct, concurrent and ever-increasing labor of all Catholics, the truth will flash out more brilliantly than ever, viz.: that truth and true prosperity flourish especially among those peoples whom the Church controls and influences: and that she holds it as her sacred duty to admonish every one of what the law of God enjoins, to unite the rich and the poor in the bonds of fraternal charity, and to lift up and strengthen men's souls in the times when adversity presses heavily upon them.

Let our commands and our wishes be confirmed by the words which are so full of apostolic charity which the Blessed Paul addressed to the Romans: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, be reformed in the newness of your mind; he that giveth, with simplicity; he that ruleth, with carefulness; he that sheweth mercy with cheerfulness. Let love be without dissimulation—hating that which is evil; clinging to that which is good; loving one another with the charity of brotherhood; with honor preventing one another; in carefulness, not slothful; rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation; instant in prayer. Communicating to the necessities of the saints. Pursuing hospitality. Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep; being of one mind to one another; to no man ren-

dering evil for evil; providing good things not only in the sight of God but also in the sight of men."

As a pledge of these benefits receive the Apostolic Benediction which, Venerable Brethren, we grant most lovingly in the Lord to you and your clergy and people.

Given at Rome in St. Peter's the 18th day of January, 1901, in the 23d year of our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., POPE.

Scientific Chronicle.

ARTIFICIAL VS. NATURAL INDIGO.

The synthetic process of building up in the chemical laboratory products which were known only as the results of the natural development of plant life, has in the past caused the abandonment of certain kinds of plant culture. This was shown in a striking way in regard to the madder plant. As late as 1870 this plant was extensively cultivated to obtain the important dye-stuff alizarin. But in 1869 a process for manufacturing this dye by fusing anthraquinone sulphonic acid and caustic soda was patented, and as a consequence the cultivation of the madder plant was abandoned. Now that such rapid strides have been made in the production of synthetic or artificial indigo the fate of the natural product is eagerly discussed by those interested.

England is most interested, for if natural indigo is driven out of the market the wealth of her Indian possessions would be temporarily, if not permanently, diminished. The indigo plant is cultivated principally in the provinces of Bengal, Madras and Oude, India. The seed is sown at the end of March or the beginning of April, and by the 1st of July, when it is cut, the plant has attained its full growth, a height of about three feet. About the beginning of September a second crop, somewhat smaller than the first, is cut. The land on which the indigo plant grows is often very poor, and very little attention is given to enriching it by fertilizers, the only manure employed being *seet*, that is indigo refuse, leaves and stalks taken from the vats after the steeping of the plants. Still the yearly yield is about the same in quantity and quality.

The process of extracting the indigo from the plant is briefly this: After the cutting the plants are tied into bundles and packed into large cement lined vats, where they are covered with clear fresh water. The plants remain in these vats until the process of fermentation, which begins quickly and lasts about 15 hours, is completed. The yellow colored liquor is then drawn off into other vats, where it is agitated either by oars worked by hand or else by machinery. During this beating the indigo separates out in blue flakes which precipitate to the bottom of the vat. When the indigo has thoroughly settled the water is drawn off and the remaining pulpy mass

is boiled with water to remove impurities, then filtered and pressed and cut into cubes and finally air dried.

The method of cultivating the plant and the process of extracting the indigo are certainly old-fashioned and in a great measure dependant on the whim of the grower and manufacturer. There has been no attempt to improve the fertilizer or to discover whether it can be improved or not. Their fathers used seed, and so did their grandfathers, and therefore the present growers use seed. No expert chemist is employed to improve the process of manufacture. Should the bundles be packed tightly or loosely in the vat? Should the water used be hard or soft? Should the plants be steeped 10, 15 or 20 hours? These questions are all answered not on a scientific basis, but according to the whim of the individual.

English scientists have awakened to the fact that something must be done to improve the methods of cultivating the indigo plant and of manufacturing the indigo if this industry is to be spared the fate of the madder industry. Artificial indigo, which is about to crowd out the natural, is the result principally of the work of German chemists and the liberality of German firms that spend large sums of money in perfecting the process of manufacture.

The process employed by the Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik Company is that of Heumann, in which phenylglycine-ortho-carboxylic acid is fused with caustic soda. At first this process yielded a product which cost more than the natural indigo. But the Badische Company employs more than 100 highly trained research chemists, and to some of these was entrusted the work of devising a way of producing phenylglycine-ortho-carboxylic acid more cheaply. As the starting product they took naphthalene, which is obtained from coal tar in very large quantities. This they oxidized by concentrated sulphuric acid in the presence of mercury or a mercury salt with the production of phthalic acid. This acid is then reacted upon to form anthranilic acid. The latter combined with monochloroacetic acid yields the desired phenylglycine-ortho-carboxylic acid.

During the process large quantities of sulphur dioxide are produced, the loss of which would be a serious matter, for on the scale on which indigo is manufactured from 25,000 to 30,000 tons of sulphur dioxide are annually produced. This is not lost, but passed over heated oxide of iron and converted into sulphuric anhydride, which by the action of water is converted into profitable sulphuric acid. In the manufacture of indigo chlorine is required to prepare the chloroacetic acid and caustic soda is needed to fuse the phenylglycine-ortho-carboxylic acid. Both of these are obtained by the electrolysis of sodium chloride. The mere mention of these processes

shows what has been done for artificial indigo and what an active opponent the natural product has to contend with.

That the competition is and will be a sharp one may be gathered from the fact that at present the price of artificial and of natural indigo is about the same. The Indigo Planters' Association is awakened. They have employed Mr. Rawson, an expert chemist, to improve the method of manufacturing the natural product, and appeals have been made to the government, which has responded by ordering that all the cloth supplied the army and navy be dyed with *natural* indigo. The question will undoubtedly depend on whether the artificial indigo can be made in sufficient quantities and sold at a lower price. It is quite safe to say that it will, seeing the energy displayed so far in its manufacture. The Badische Company alone has spent nearly \$5,000,000 in improving the manufacture of artificial indigo, and other companies like the "Farben Fabrik" are following this lead. It is safe to predict that the indigo industry will pass from England to Germany, the supply being furnished not by the fields of India, but by the laboratories of Germany.

This is another instance of the success that attends an alliance between science and industry and pointedly stated last September in an address by Professor Carhardt to the American Institute of Electrical Engineers. After mentioning some details with regard to the large sums of money spent in scientific work in Germany, he says: "The results have already justified, in a remarkable manner, all the expenditure of labor and money. The renown in exact scientific measurements formerly possessed by France and England has now largely been transferred to Germany. Formerly scientific workers in the United States looked to England for exact standards, especially in the department of electricity; now they go to Germany." And again: "Germany is rapidly moving toward industrial supremacy in Europe. One of the most potent factors in this notable advance is the perfected alliance between science and commerce existing in Germany. Science has come to be regarded there as a commercial factor. If England is losing her supremacy in manufacture and in commerce, as many claim, it is because of English conservatism and the failure to utilize to the fullest extent the lessons taught by science."

SPACE TELEGRAPHY.

Wireless telegraphy has proved its utility as a means of communicating with ships at sea and with isolated stations which could not

be reached by cable. Here its utility seemed to cease, because at any one station the transmitter would influence all the receivers within its field of influence, and in turn its receiver would be actuated by all the transmitters within its range of susceptibility. There was therefore no privacy in the messages sent out, for there was no selective system of signalling, and there was, moreover, nothing but confusion when two or more stations tried to communicate with a given station at the same time. The labors of several workers have been directed to the overcoming of this difficulty, and a solution seems to have been reached by Professor Slaby, of the Charlottenberg Technical High School.

Professor Slaby was working on a system of wireless telegraphy for use in the German navy which would not infringe the Marconi patents when he found the solution referred to. He describes his invention in a lecture published in the *Electrotechnische Zeitschrift*. In every station from which messages are sent out by wireless telegraphy there is a tall vertical wire. Electrical oscillations are set up in this wire and their wave-length depends on the length of this wire. The longer the wire the longer the wave length of the electrical oscillation sent out. An idea of this may be gathered from the analogy of a vibrating rod. A vertical rod clamped at its lowest point in a vise and set in vibration oscillates backward and forward to the right and left of its position of rest. The motion is greatest at its upper free end and is zero at the point at which it is clamped. This latter point is called a nodal point or a node. Suppose the vertical position of the rod to be extended upward in space. Begin at the node and to the right of this line and draw lateral perpendiculars to the line of rest of the rod, making the lengths of the perpendiculars proportional to the velocities of the parts of the vibrating rod. We will have a series of lines to the right gradually increasing in length from zero to a maximum representing the velocities of the rod as it moves from rest to its furthest position to the right. If we continue these perpendiculars upward in reverse order to represent the relative velocities as the rod returns to its position of rest and then connect the extremities of these perpendiculars by a line we shall have a curve beginning on the right at the bottom of the rod and extending outward to a maximum distance opposite the top of the rod and gradually returning to the line of extension of the rod until it meets that line at twice the height of the rod. But the rod moves past its position of rest to the left, and a similar curve constructed to the left of the vertical and beyond the first curve represents the excursion to the left and return of the rod to its vertical position. The whole curve, that is, the part to the right plus the part to the left, represents the complete to and fro motion of the rod

or a complete oscillation, and is called a wave. It is evident that the rod is just one-quarter of the length of the wave.

So it is with the electrical oscillation set up in the vertical wire used in wireless telegraphy. The lowest point, or that at which it is grounded, is at rest electrically or is at what is technically called zero potential, and the free end is at maximum potential just as the free end of the rod had maximum velocity. So just as the rod was one-quarter of the wave length, so the length of the wire is one-quarter of the electrical wave length set up in it and radiated into space. Hence by varying the length of the wire electrical waves of any desired length can be sent out into space.

These oscillations will be taken up by another wire whose rate of electrical vibration is the same, and a receiver connected with this wire will be worked by these electric waves. But as the most vigorous part of the oscillation of the rod was the top, so the most vigorous part of the electric oscillation is at the top of the vertical wire. Hence to make sure of the working of the receiving apparatus it should be connected with the top of the vertical wire. This, however is not practicable, and here Professor Slaby overcomes the difficulty by a very simple device.

Reverting to the analogy of the vibrating rod, it is clear that if a rod of twice the length was clamped in the middle and both ends left free there would be developed in the lower half oscillations of the same amplitude as those in the upper half when the rod was set vibrating. In a similar way Professor Slaby attaches to the bottom of the vertical wire, just where it is grounded, a wire of the same length, and electrical oscillations of the same amplitude as those in the vertical wire are set up in this extension wire, which may be straight or coiled. The receiving instruments are attached to this extension wire.

This extension wire forms the main feature of Professor Slaby's invention and enables him to arrange a multiple system of signalling. For this arrangement of wire will respond to waves of only one length, and waves of all other lengths will go to earth at the point at which it is grounded. By varying the length of the extension wire the nodal point of the oscillation will be shifted from the ground point to some point along the extension wire, and thus waves of different lengths will be detected. Thus it is possible to arrange by means of the extension wires the receiving apparatus of a certain station so that only the waves of a certain length will actuate the instruments, and therefore only the messages intended for that station will be received there. Thus secrecy is secured unless the wave length of the transmitter be known. There can be at any one station a number of receivers, each actuated only by its corresponding

transmitter, and hence a number of messages can be received at the same time.

Improvements have been made in the transmitting apparatus by which the length of the wave sent out is completely under control. Experiments are to be made on German naval vessels to determine the length at which signalling with this improved apparatus is possible, and the results are awaited with interest.

NOVA PERSEI.

On February 21 Dr. T. D. Anderson, of Edinburgh, discovered in the constellation Perseus a new star. On the report of this discovery the Harvard photographic plates of that part of the sky were examined. The plates examined were those taken during the month preceding the discovery. The plates of February 2, 6, 8, 18 and 19 showed the new star. Its magnitude, according to the plate of February 19, was less than 10.5. It rapidly grew in brightness, and on Sunday morning it rivaled in brilliancy the beautifully bright star Sirius. Since that date it has begun to grow fainter, but yet remained during the week following a star of the first magnitude, distinctly brighter than its most conspicuous neighbors, which are stars of the second magnitude.

One of the most remarkable things about this event is the fact that only now are we receiving knowledge of an event which took place long ago, may be one thousand years ago. We learn of it only from the few rays of light that have just reached us. They may have been on their journey one thousand years or more. How long these messengers have been traveling we cannot say. They have been with us so short a time that we have not been able to determine what the astronomers call the parallax, by means of which we calculate the distance of the star from us. We know the rate at which these bright messengers traveled, but not knowing how far they have come we cannot say how long ago they started. In fact, the star we see may have been extinct for the last one hundred or perhaps thousand years.

What happened so long ago? What news do these messengers bring us? It is not easy to interpret the message. By quite a general consent the best interpretation has been given by Seeliger. This hypothesis was advanced shortly after the appearance in January, 1892, of Nova Auriga, which was also discovered by Dr. Anderson.

According to this explanation a dark orb traveling through space with a great velocity encounters a nebula or cloud of cosmic dust,

The result of the collision and the friction would be the generation of a great quantity of heat sufficient to render the surface of the dead star incandescent and to vaporize some of its material. Parts of the nebula would also glow from the same cause. They would continue to emit light until they had radiated this heat into space; when cooled down they would again disappear from view.

The spectroscopic study of Nova Auriga supplied the data for this hypothesis. The new star gave two superimposed spectra, indicating two sources of the light received. One spectrum was characteristic of a nebula, the other of an incandescent solid. There is already some indication of a similar condition of things in the present new star Nova Persei. Whether this be the explanation of the phenomena of temporary stars or not the Nova Persei is attracting attention and careful observations are being taken which may throw light on such occurrences. Rev. John Hagen, S. J., Director of the Georgetown College Observatory, has issued a chart of the neighborhood of the new star. Accompanying this chart there is data for observing the brightness of the star and the comparison stars are given. It is intended for observance of brightness while the star is a naked-eye variable. A new chart is preparing for work on the star when it grows too faint for naked eye work.

THE STEAM TURBINE.

The principles of steam engineering have just completed one revolution. They have gone through a circle and have just returned to the starting point. Beginning in the year 120 B. C. with Hero's reaction steam turbine, steam engineering passed through the steam impact engine of Bianca and then the different forms of reciprocating engines to return again to the rotatory turbine as the most efficient form of engine. In Hero's engine the wheel or sphere was turned by the reaction of two jets of steam issuing from two bent pipes inserted at opposite ends of a diameter of the wheel. In Bianca's engine a paddle wheel was set in rotation by a jet of steam blowing against the vanes.

Both of these principles are made use of in the steam turbines of the present day. The blades of the turbines receive motion first from the impact of the steam striking them and secondly from the reaction of the steam leaving them.

Recent experiments with steam turbines show an efficiency of 70 per cent., a result never attained by any piston engine. The steam turbine such as we have it to-day is undoubtedly the coming form of steam motor, for the line of development involves high speeds and

transmission of energy in the form of electricity. In the steam turbine there are no reciprocating parts; there is the rotatory engine adapted for direct connection with electric generators. There is high speed, steadiness of motion and a steam economy higher than that attained by any piston engine yet constructed.

NOTES.

Motive Power for Street Railways.—To understand the rapid application of electricity as the motive power for street railways we have but to compare the cost of operating such roads by electricity with the cost of operating them by other systems. The means of comparison is furnished by the report of the Metropolitan Street Railway Company of New York. According to this report the average cost for horse cars was 18.98 cents per car mile, and then it must be remembered that the cars were much smaller than those used on other systems. The cost for cable cars was 17.76 cents and for electric cars 13.66 cents per car mile. The item of cost, then, is decidedly in favor of electric traction. There is only one other system that may compete with the electric system, and that is the compressed air system. The data furnished from this system as applied in New York on a road in which the round trip is five and a half miles at present gives 17.42 cents per car mile as the running expense. However, it is not fair to compare these figures with those given for electric traction, for the compressor used is of far too great capacity for the work it now does and is capable of doing three times the work at about the same expense. Still it is doubtful if for long distances it would ever prove satisfactory and as cheap as electricity. Electricity has come to remain as the most reliable, most convenient and most economical form of energy for traction on street cars.

Aluminum.—Fifty years ago aluminum was a laboratory curiosity and was worth more than its weight in gold on account of the cost of reducing it. Thirty years ago the annual production was about one ton a year and the cost of the metal was twelve dollars a pound. Twenty years ago its production began to increase on account of a cheapening in the production of sodium, which was up to that time employed in the reduction of aluminum. About this time the price of aluminum fell to five dollars a pound. To-day the industry is on an entirely different basis. It is now produced in quantities not of 70 tons a year, but the annual output reaches 7,000 tons, and the price is reduced to 30 cents a pound. The supply is unable to keep up with the demand. The increased supply was possible by the use

of electricity to reduce the metal, and the demand increases on account of the fine qualities of aluminum and the possibilities of using it more extensively since the price is lowered. This briefly tells the story of an unparalleled development in a branch of applied science.

Metric System.—The committee of the House of Representatives in charge of the bill to substitute the metric system in place of our present system of weights and measures has decided to make a favorable report. Besides the numerous other advantages there is the commercial advantage by abolishing a system that hampers our trade with almost all foreign countries, especially with the South American republics. The English speaking races only hold on to the old clumsy system in spite of every argument of utility and convenience in favor of the decimal system. It is encouraging to note the equally strong agitation in England in favor of the metric system, and if both England and the United States would simultaneously adopt it its application would be easier and more rapid.

New Gutta-Percha.—The report comes from Zanzibar that a new material resembling gutta-percha has been discovered. It is derived from a tree. When the tree is tapped a white fluid exudes which in boiling water coagulates into a substance which in character bears a strong resemblance to gutta-percha. This material becomes very hard on cooling, but while soft it can easily be moulded into any desired shape. Although it is not equal to genuine gutta-percha, still as it is quite suitable for many of the purposes for which the latter is used it will undoubtedly assume a commercial importance.

Count Zeppelin's Airship.—This airship has made another trial, that of October 17 last, which is thus described by Herr Eugen Wolf, who took part in the ascent: "The trial lasted one hour and twenty minutes. The start upwards was first rate. The airship moved at an almost unvaried height of 300 metres and went against the wind. All the steering tests proved the efficacy of the new gear, and the airship satisfactorily answered the movements of the steering apparatus. The horizontal stability of the vessel was wonderful. Any list was easily counteracted by shifting the sliding weight. The speed of the airship was such that when going against the wind it outstripped the motor boats on the lake. In still air its own speed was at least eight metres per second. We descended at full speed in the direction of the airship's shed, rather faster than we expected, owing to an as yet unexplained escape of the whole of the gas in one of the balloons in the forward part of the ship. No damage of any importance happened the ship." The German Emperor has conferred on Count von Zeppelin the Order of the Red Eagle, First Class. In his letter to the Count the Emperor says: "The advantages of your system—the division of the long, extended balloon

into compartments, the equal distribution of the burden by means of two independent engines and a rudder working with success for the first time in a vertical direction—have enabled your airship to move with the greatest speed which has hitherto been attained, and have rendered it amenable to the rudder.” The Emperor has placed the advice and experience of the balloon division of the army at the disposal of the Count.

Wireless Telegraphy.—The satisfactory results obtained in testing the utility of wireless telegraphy as a means of communication between the vessels that run from Dover to Ostend and either of the above named points shows that it is practicable. The vessel selected for the test was the Belgian mail packet *Princess Clementine*. The receiving and sending wires were connected to the foremast, which had been previously increased considerably in height. The land station was between Ostend and Dunkirk at La Panne. The mast used at La Panne was 130 feet high and the distance to Dover 61 miles. As the vessel left Ostend a message was sent to La Panne and messages continued to be transmitted at frequent intervals up to the time the vessel reached Dover. These messages were transmitted at the rate of twenty words a minute. The results were satisfactory beyond what had been expected.

Another invention in connection with wireless telegraphy is an apparatus by which ships may be warned of their approach to danger in time of fog or in places where a simpler means of signaling cannot be employed. A revolving wheel having teeth of varying sizes on its circumference is made to work a Morse key which is connected with a set of wireless telegraph transmitting instruments. The varying sizes of the teeth depress the key for a longer or shorter time, and thus a system of dashes and dots can be transmitted. By a proper arrangement of the teeth on the revolving wheel the dashes and dots may be made to spell the name of a place or vessel. Any vessel coming within the zone of influence of this system and provided with instruments for receiving electric waves can be warned by the ringing of a bell and the reception of the message.

Still another advance in wireless telegraphy is reported. Professor Fleming has announced to the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce that Mr. Marconi has succeeded in transmitting messages a distance of 200 miles, and that messages could be sent simultaneously in both directions and two or more could be received at once at each station. This result indicates that the difficulty of interference of messages has been at least partially overcome.

The Malaria Campaign.—The numerous and extensive experiments conducted during the last two years and the clear results reached leave no doubt as to the method by which malaria is pro-

pagated. The mosquito is convicted. Now attention is turned to the plan of campaign to be followed to stamp out malaria. The first views on the best method of malaria prophylaxis seems on reflection impracticable. The hope that the mosquito would be exterminated by drainage and the use of culicicides is too sanguine. There are very large districts where this cannot be accomplished. Still in some localities joined with a use of mosquito curtains and quinine it will bring about a marked improvement. Still, strange as it may at first appear, the most successful plan of campaign seems to be to work to preserve the mosquito from infection and thus limit the chances of disseminating the parasites. This may be done by a prolonged treatment of patients with quinine, and during the time they have parasites in their blood they should be isolated and protected from mosquitoes by a proper use of mosquito netting.

A Use of Liquid Air.—The cartridges used for blasting trials in the Simplon tunnel consisted of a wrapper filled with some carbonaceous material such as a mixture of equal parts of paraffin and charcoal and dipped into liquid air until they were completely soaked. These cartridges had to be kept in liquid air until they were needed and then put quickly into the shot holes and detonated with a small guncotton primer and detonator. This haste in using the cartridge is necessitated by the short life of the cartridge. Those used at the Simplon tunnel measured eight inches in length and three in diameter and had to be used within fifteen minutes after their removal from the liquid air in order to avoid a missfire. Their use on this account was abandoned, but much time and labor is being devoted to their improvement, especially in Germany.

Historic Astronomical Instruments.—From *Nature* of December 27, 1900, we take the following note, which will be of interest to our readers: "Our attention has been directed to the following surpris-announcement made by the Pekin correspondent of the *Times*: 'In pursuance of their regrettable policy of appropriation, the French and German generals, with Count von Waldersee's approval, have removed from the wall of Pekin the superb astronomical instruments erected two centuries ago by the Jesuit fathers. Half of them will go to Berlin and the rest to Paris. The explanation of this act of vandalism is that, inasmuch as the return of the Court is so improbable, such beautiful instruments should not be exposed to the possibilities of injury when Pekin is no longer the capital.'"

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston College.

Book Notices.

PHILOSOPHIA LACENSIS. *Institutiones Juris Naturalis ad usum Scholarum adornavit. T. Meyer, S. J. Pars II.* Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis, Mo., 1900. 8vo, pp. 26, 852.

With the present volume the *Philosophia Lacensis* the course of neo-scholastic philosophy emanating from Maria Laach, the one-time scholasticate of the German Jesuits, is brought to a close. Begun twenty years ago, shortly after the appearance of the memorable Encyclical of Leo XIII. on Thomistic studies, the *Cursus Lacensis* is to-day the most scholarly and perhaps profound work of its kind that has thus far been produced. As to its eruditional features, it is certainly unrivaled. Its authors have set forth the complete system of Catholic philosophy not only in detail, but in its relations to the manifold forms of alien speculation, past and present. The only other work that heretofore aimed at establishing so full a comparison between the *philosophia perennis* and other systems and phases of philosophy is Sanseverino's well-known *Philosophia Christiana Antiqua Cum Nova Comparata*. The latter work, however, never came within more than a third of completion, where the lamented death of its author left it a quarter of a century ago. It contains no word, therefore, of the movements of thought in more recent years. The *Cursus Lacensis*, however, brings its subject matter close *en rapport* with contemporary speculation. Indeed, there is hardly any philosophical theory or opinion worthy of note that has appeared during the past decade, especially in that radiating centre of new philosophies, Germany, that has not been weighed and sifted. It is perhaps this feature of the work, its references to the recent German literature of philosophy as viewed by neo-scholasticism, that gives it its special importance for the Catholic student.

As regards profundity, however, and particularly clarity of exposition, the work in our estimation has, to say the least, a compeer in the colossal monument reared by Father Urrabni. Nor if we except the references to German philosophy are the *Institutiones Philosophicae* of the eminent Spanish Jesuit much inferior in point of erudition to the present production of his brethren beyond the Rhine. For the benefit of the reader interested in the subject it may here be said that the *Cursus Lacensis* as it now stands embraces three royal octavos, containing in all about 1,800 pages devoted to Logic, three volumes of almost equal extent on Psychology, two volumes of about half that compass on *Philosophia Naturalis*, one volume rival-

ing the latter in bulk on Theodicy. The first volume on Moral Philosophy contains in round numbers 500 pages, and the second about 850. These figures will help to give the reader some impression as to the amplitude of the series. It should be noted, however, that about one-third, *i. e.*, the last volume of the section on Logic, embraces the matter ordinarily allotted to the department of Ontology; the author, Father Pesch, having subsumed under what he calls *logica realis*, an exposition of the fundamental concepts and principles of General Metaphysics. There are, of course, valid reasons for the latter arrangement. On the whole we prefer the treating of so singularly vital a section of the philosophical system as Ontology under its traditional caption, particularly as such an arrangement gives due emphasis to the objective character of metaphysical concepts, an emphasis that cannot, we believe, be too strongly insisted upon in times when the tendency is to relegate metaphysics to the realm of purely subjective figments.

It should also be noted that the *Cursus Lacensis* provides no treatment of the history of philosophy. We cannot but regard this as the one *lacuna* in the work. The literature of scholastic philosophy is unfortunately inadequate in this department and students interested in the matter had hoped that the present series would provide what is so much needed. An historical exposition of the development of philosophy, with supplementary and critical references to the contents of these volumes, would both enhance the value of the *Cursus Lacensis* itself and promote very considerably the general aim for which the work has been produced. Failing, however, this much to be desired completion, no more fitting crown could have been given to the structure than that which is embodied in Father Meyer's *Moral Philosophy*, a work which keeps quite up to the high standard set by the preceding portions of the course.

The first volume, dealing with *General Ethics*, was published fifteen years ago and was subsequently reviewed in these pages. The matter covered in that volume is confined to the general principles of Ethics, individual and social. The second volume, which, by the way, almost doubles the compass of its predecessor, is devoted to special ethics, to the applying that is, of the general notions and principles of morality to the various relations of human life. The whole falls under the caption *Jus Naturæ Sociale*, and divides spontaneously into *individual right*, *private social right* and *public social right*. Under the first section come the rites of the individual towards God, himself and his fellow-men; under the second are examined the juridic concepts growing out of domestic society and the relations of property; whilst the third and by far the largest portion of the volume is concerned with the rights and duties emanating

from the civil and public relations inherent in the body politic, *Staatsrecht*, as the Germans call it; and from the external relations of nations, international right, the *Völkerrecht* of the Germans.

The lines of treatment here laid down are, of course, those familiar to every student of Social Ethics, essential as they must be to the subject matter itself. The special merit of the work consists in the depth and breadth with which individual questions are examined. Thus, for instance, to the right of property over one hundred pages are devoted. This affords room for a satisfactory examination of the leading features and claims of socialism. A fundamental question of supreme importance is that which centres in the end or purpose of civil society. This the author has discussed very carefully and adequately in no less than six goodly "theses." The functions of civil authority are also treated with the comprehensiveness demanded by such vital topics as the relations of the State to religion, economics, education, etc.

In fact, there is no important question that enters into the perennial organism of moral philosophy or that has grown out of the more complex relationships of modern society, or that has been necessitated by the attacks of scepticism against the basis or framework of Christian Ethics that does not receive in this volume their just measure of consideration. Readers of the "Newer Ethic" may miss in it reference to some names that cast a large shadow in the recent book world; but the line of such reference, whether to orthodox or to heterodox writers, had to be drawn somewhere, and the author has temperately drawn it at the most noteworthy and enduring literature of his subject.

On the whole, we believe we can give the work no more fitting commendation than by saying that it deserves to take a place by the side of the great *Saggio* of Taparelli and the *Moral Philosophie* of Cathrein, the two works that stand easily to the front in the nineteenth century literature of Ethics.

COURSE OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION. Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

EXPOSITION OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By a Seminary Professor. Intermediate Course. Part III. Worship. 12mo, pp. xvi., 833. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey.

This volume completes a course of religious instruction which must appeal to all teachers whose duty it is to instruct others in Christian doctrine; to all students who are trying to acquire such important knowledge, and to all intelligent Catholics who feel every day the necessity of being able to explain the doctrines and cere-

monies of the Church. St. Peter recommended the first Christians to be always ready to give an account of their faith. The same admonition has been given by the Church to her children in all ages. She is confident that if men know her they will love her and follow her teachings, because she is the spouse of Christ, and her doctrines are His doctrines. Those who refuse to listen to her; who persecute her and calumniate her, do so because they are ignorant of her true teachings and her true history.

Catholics themselves are largely responsible for this. We do not speak of those who are poor, hard-worked and unlearned. Through no fault of their own they are prevented from gaining that fuller knowledge which would enable them to enlighten others. But God has given the grace of faith to them, and they are deserving of all honor for preserving it, and submitting humbly to the guidance of His Church. Their lives speak more eloquently than words. But at the present day those who are born and brought up in this country cannot excuse themselves for ignorance of the doctrines of the Church. In this age of schools, libraries and books, if any one remain ignorant of any important subject it must be because he will not enlighten himself. This is certainly true of the Catholic Faith. The explanations of Catholic faith, morals and ceremonial which have come from the press in recent years are so many and so various that every one should be able to prove to the world that the Church is the spouse of Christ, speaking to men by His authority and in His name. The "Exposition of Christian Doctrine" which is completed by the volume before us, is a striking illustration of this truth. In these three volumes the whole field is covered. It is a clear, concise, complete summary of Catholic faith, morals and ceremonial. With this book in hand an apostle could convert the world.

The first volume of the series treated of Dogma, the second of Morals and the third treats of Worship. As worship is the living and active expression of dogma and morals, it follows them in logical order.

In the introduction the plan of the present volume is thus clearly set forth: "It may be divided into four sections: A preliminary section: On *Grace*, without which we can neither please God nor sanctify ourselves. Three principal sections: 1. On *Prayer*, by which we raise ourselves to God and ask His grace. 2. On the *Sacraments*, which are sensible signs that signify and produce grace. 3. On the *Liturgy*, which regulates public prayer, the administration of the sacraments and above all the celebration of the holy sacrifice of the Mass. We recommend the book to priests who have already gained the knowledge which it contains, but who must constantly refresh their memories and verify their statements, and who can no-

where else find all that they need so easily as here. We recommend it to teachers who are using other manuals, because it conflicts with none, but completes all. We recommend it to every Catholic family, because it is a complete library of Christian Doctrine. We recommend it to every intelligent Catholic who ought to know the doctrines and ceremonies of his Church well enough to explain them to others. Finally, we recommend it to all fair-minded Protestants who want to know the truth about this great Christian Organization, the Roman Catholic Church, which claims to speak to all men in the name of Jesus Christ, and by His authority, and demands from all that obedience which they owe to Him. No one can afford to be ignorant of such an organization, and it is only fair to ask herself for her credentials.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791. The Original French, Latin and Italian Texts, with English Translations and Notes. Illustrated by Portraits, Maps and Facsimiles. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites. Vol. LXXI. Lower Canada, Illinois, 1750-1791. Miscellaneous Data. 8vo, pp. 404. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers.

With this volume the text of the great work is completed. Volumes 72 and 73 will contain an analytical index to the seventy-one volumes of text. In addition to the usual interesting letters, this volume has an important document which enumerates and describes the fiefs and seigniories belonging to the Jesuits in Canada in 1781-88. For the further information and convenience of students the following addenda have been made to the text: A list of the Governors and intendants of New France (1608-1760), and of English Governors of Canada (1760-1805); a catalogue of Jesuit missionaries to New France and Louisiana (1611-1800), prepared for this volume by Rev. Arthur E. Jones, S. J., of Montreal; lists of the documents and illustrations published in this series; a list of authorities (printed and MSS.) cited or consulted in the preparation of the series, and some necessary errata and addenda, inevitable in so long a series as the present.

The text covers an interesting period, for it deals with the close of the war between France and England and the passing of Quebec into the hands of the conqueror. Some of the questions which are now claiming the attention of the United States authorities in the Philippines are here discussed; questions of right to property justly acquired and lawfully held by the Church or communities.

At the end of the volume we have an excellent copy of the oil portrait supposed to represent Pere Marquette, which was discovered in Montreal in 1897. It is the first portrait of the great

missionary and explorer that has been found, and the proofs of its authenticity are becoming stronger every day. The story of its rescue in the shape of a panel, from a hand-cart filled with rubbish and broken boards which two French boys had procured from an old house that was being torn down, and which they were taking home for fire-wood, is very interesting. Fortunately the rescue was made by Donald Guthrie McNab, the well-known portrait painter of Toronto. At first he saw in it only a panel with an old picture painted on it. After keeping it for about two years he cleaned it. This was a very difficult task, for the dirt that covered it was held fast with many coats of varnish. At last after much patient care, because the paint was cracked, the artist saw revealed a face that might have been the work of Rembrandt. Further effort revealed the name of the painter, "R. Roos, 1669," and above it the words, "Marquette de la Confrerie de Jesus." On the back of the panel, which measures $13\frac{3}{4} \times 17\frac{3}{4}$ inches, and is about half an inch thick, are carved the words, "Pere Marquette." This portrait is a fitting ending to this splendid reproduction of the Jesuit Relations.

MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE, THE TEACHING AND THE PASSION OF JESUS CHRIST for Every Day of the Ecclesiastical Year. With an appendix of Meditations for the Festivals of Various Saints. By *Rev. Augustine Maria Ilg, O. S. F. O.* Translated from the latest German Edition. Edited by *Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J.* 2 vols., 12mo, pp. 561, 510. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"The present work is principally compiled from an old book of meditations by a Capuchin monk, Father Alphonsus von Zussmerhausen, Definitor and Vicar Provincial, published in Cologne in the year 1712, and entitled "A Mirror of the Virtues Displayed in the Life and Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

A few years ago a copy of this old book fell into the hands of Father Ilg, of the same order. He recognized its merits, brought it to the attention of his superior, and at his request he compiled from it a series of meditations for every day in the year, written in modern language, fitted to the requirements of the present day and suited for the use of priests and religious of both sexes. Those who were familiar with the old book would hardly recognize it in the new. The author of the later work "compares himself to an architect, who being commissioned to restore an old house of solid construction and make of it a modern residence, finds it the better way, instead of repairing here and altering there, to pull down the whole structure and rebuild it on the same site on a new plan, employing the same substantial materials, and only adding others where they proved inadequate for his purpose. Thus the author took the greater part of his matter—the most solid and valuable stones needed for the edi-

vice he was raising—from the work of the old Capuchin Father; he also introduces many apt quotations from well-known ascetical writings, such as Rodriguez's *Christian Perfection* and the incomparable *Imitation of Christ*."

The work is begun with "An Introduction to Mental Prayer in General, and to This Book in Particular." Each meditation consists of an introductory picture and three points. The matter is very clear and very logical. The author seems to have found the secret of giving just enough to excite thought without distracting the mind or destroying individuality.

In the appendix we find meditations for certain feasts of Our Blessed Lady and some of the saints. No particular order has been followed in this department, and the reader will find some names almost unknown to him, while he will search for better known names in vain.

Following the appendix there is an "Index to Meditations Suitable for Retreats," and then an "Alphabetical Index." The appearance of works of this kind is a healthy sign. It indicates the growth of mental prayer. We do not doubt that the present work will prove thought-provoking for many minds, and that is the end of meditation books.

SHORT LIVES OF DOMINICAN SAINTS. By a Sister of the Congregation of St. Catharine of Siena (Stone). Edited, with introduction, by Very Rev. Father Proctor, S. T. L., Provincial of the English Dominicans. 8vo, pp. xxiii, 352. New York: Benziger Brothers

This book contains nearly a hundred names of persons who have been canonized or declared blessed. Nearly all were members of the Dominican Order; some few are included because of their close connection with the order, although they were not actually members of it. They are arranged, not in alphabetical or chronological order, but in the order suggested by the Calendar of the Dominican rite. The lives are short in order that they may be included in one volume, and in order to attract the reader who might be repelled by longer biographies. The principal authorities from which the facts are taken are Marchese's "*Diario Domenicano*," the Lessons in the Dominican Breviary and the excellent work, "*L'Année Dominicaine*." The last named work has only reached the end of August, although it already numbers sixteen large volumes.

We find many illustrious names in this compendium. St. Raymond of Pennafort, St. Catharine de Ricci, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Catharine of Siena, and the great founder of the order, St. Dominic, are but a few of those who stand out prominently.

Father Procter's Introduction is a very valuable part of the work. It sets forth clearly and in an attractive manner the value of the lives of the saints and the profit to be gained from the study of them. It points out in a particular manner the excellence of the lives recorded in this volume. The book ought to do all that the compiler and editor hope for it. Lessons of virtue are best taught by the lives of those who practiced them. Most persons learn by example. Pictures appeal to all children, small and big, young and old. Here are pictures of all the virtues worthy of imitation.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGICÆ DOGMATICÆ. Tract. de Sacramentis. Pars I. De Sac. in gen., Bapt., Confirm., Euch. *Auctore P. Einig.* Treviris, ex Officina ad S. Paulinum, 1900. 8vo, pp. 10, 248. Price, 3 marks.

The preceding volumes of these Institutes of Dogmatics have been successively brought to the attention of our readers. They appeal, of course, primarily to the student and professor in our ecclesiastical seminaries. Their didactic method, clarity and precision of statement and brevity, combined with comprehensiveness of exposition, adapt them perfectly for their end as text-books. The fact, too, that each volume, though part of an organic whole, is complete in itself, has also an advantage in the same connection. The clergy in the ministry will also find these tracts of service for ready reference and as facile instruments for reviewing former studies. Their bibliographical references, which embrace the best authorities, old and new, on their respective subjects, will prove helpful. The present treatises on the Sacraments in general, Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist, sustain the merit of the earlier volumes. One more volume, promised for the near future, will complete the work.

BEATI PETRI CANISII, SOCIETATIS JESU EPISTULÆ ET ACTA. Collegit et Adnotationibus Illustravit. *Otto Braunsberger, S. J.* Vols. II., III. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$7.50 per vol.

These two magnificent volumes cover the important period of the life of Blessed Peter Canisius between the years 1556, when he was made provincial of the Jesuits in Germany and founded the College of Ingolstadt, and 1562, when he took a prominent part in the closing scenes of the Council of Trent. The correspondence presents the saintly missionary in the very prime of life, with growing fame and influence. There was scarcely a distinguished Catholic of the age, from Pius IV. and Emperor Ferdinand down, who did not figure among the correspondents of this remarkable man.

He was the acknowledged leader of the great Catholic Reaction in Germany, and thanks to the documents which Father Braunsberger is now bringing to light, we are enabled to follow the process of the reacquisition of German territory step by step. The subject demands more than a mere notice.

THE LAW AND POLICY OF ANNEXATION, with Special Reference to the Philippines. Together with Observations on the Status of Cuba. By *Carman F. Randolph*, of the New York Bar, author of "The Law of Eminent Domain." 8vo, pp. 226. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"The annexation of the Philippines is the immediate reason for this book, which, in dealing with the event itself, advocates withdrawal of our sovereignty from the islands and suggests a method for its accomplishment. In the larger and permanent purpose of the book the event is but the text for a general discussion of annexation, with regard to the policies proper for the guidance of the United States in the matter of enlarging their territory, and to the obligations that go with their sovereignty."

This is a very timely book. It is interesting and valuable, not only to those who are in authority and who must deal directly with this important question, but to all citizens, who should understand clearly the reasons that underly the actions of their representatives. It is so easy to learn law from newspapers that generally are the organs of parties or individuals, and are too often the creatures of prejudice. History has too many examples of injustice done in the name of law, but in obedience to public clamor raised by ignorant or wicked men. Such mistakes can be prevented by right-minded and well informed citizens.

THE NEW RACCOLTA; or, Collection of Prayers and Good Works, to which the Sovereign Pontiffs have attached Holy Indulgences. Published in 1898 by Order of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. From the Third Italian Edition, authorized and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Holy Indulgences. 12mo, pp. 684. Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham & Sons.

Here is a complete and authentic collection of the prayers and pious exercises to which the Roman Pontiffs have attached indulgences. Other editions of the book have appeared from time to time, but the present edition was ordered by our Holy Father Leo XIII., because new prayers and good works which have been enriched with indulgences were not contained in previous additions, and because others had been omitted that were not presented at the proper time.

This book is the authorized translation of the Italian *Raccolta*, which has the approval of the Holy Father, and is to be regarded by all as the correct and authorized collection of indulgences hitherto granted for all the faithful. "If by chance any doubt should arise

either as to sense of the grant or the conditions requisite for gaining the indulgences, it must be determined solely by this *Raccolta* which His Holiness has directed to be considered the complete guide."

BIBLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von *Professor Dr. O. Bardenheuer*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$1.20.

The series of "Biblical Studies" begun on occasion of the Papal Encyclical on the Holy Scriptures has gone on increasing in interest and importance and has now reached the sixth volume. The several numbers are the work of the first Catholic writers of Germany and present the results of their studies in a concise and attractive manner.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- TRACTATUS DE GRATIA DIVINA.** Auctore *P. Sancto Schiffini, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$2.90 net.
- TRACTATUS DE DEO TRINO.** Auctore *Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Forming Vol. III. of *Summa Theologica ad modum commentarii in Aquinatis Summam*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$3.60 net.
- PLAIN SERMONS ON THE FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.** By the *Rev. R. D. Browne*. Second Edition. 12mo, pp. 514. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- IN THE BEGINNING (Les Origines).** By *J. Guibert, S. S.*, Superior of the "Institute Catholique," of Paris. Translated from the French by G. S. Whitmarsh. 12mo, pp. 379. Illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE INFLUENCE OF CATHOLICISM ON THE SCIENCES AND ON THE ARTS.** From the Spanish. 12mo, pp. 160. St. Louis: Herder.
- ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI.** By the *Rev. Leopold de Chérançé, O. S. F. O.* Authorized translation from the French. By R. F. O'Connor. Third Edition. Enlarged and Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 411. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- EUCCHARISTIC CONFERENCES.** Preached in Lent, 1894, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Paris, by Rev. Father Monsabré, O. P. Translated from the French by Comtesse Mary Jenison. 12mo, pp. 181. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- MARY WARD: A Foundress of the Seventeenth Century.** By *Mother M. Salome*, of the Bar Convent, York. With an Introduction by the Bishop of Newport. 12mo, pp. 272. Illustrated. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- LIFE OF THE VERY REV. FELIX DE ANDRIES, C. M.,** First Superior of the Congregation of the Mission in the United States and Vicar General of Upper Louisiana. Chiefly from sketches written by the Right Rev. Joseph Rosati, C. M., First Bishop of St. Louis. 12mo, pp. 308, with portrait. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- MAGISTER ADEST; or, Who is Like to God?** With Preface by the Rev. Charles Blount, S. J. 12mo, pp. 388. Illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- ILLUSTRATED EXPLANATION OF THE APOSTLES CREED.** A Thorough Exposition of Catholic Faith. Adapted from the Original of Rev. H. Rolfus, D. D., by Very Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C. SS. R. 12mo, pp. 360. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE SAINTS. SAINT NICHOLAS I.** By *Jules Roy*. Translated by Margaret Maitland. 12mo, pp. 200. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE BIBLE.** By *Richard G. Moulton, M. A., Ph. D.*, Professor of English Literature in the University of Chicago. Author of the "Literary Study of the Bible." 12mo, pp. 374. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
- THE CONFESSOR, after the Heart of Jesus.** Considerations proposed to Priests, by Canon A. Guerra, Honorary Chamberlain to His Holiness. 12mo, pp. 163. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- LIFE OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.** By *Rev. J. Putseus*, Honorary Canon and Former Student of the Carmelite School. 12mo, pp. 195. Somerset, Ohio: The Rosary Press.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVI—JULY, 1901—No. 103.

ROYAL OATHS AND DOCTRINAL SUBTERFUGES.

"**P**HILAGATHARCHES," says the Rev. Sydney Smith, "is an instance of a love of toleration combined with a love of persecution. He is a Dissenter, and earnestly demands religious liberty for that body of men; but as for the Catholics, he would not only continue their present disabilities, but load them with every new one that could be conceived. He expressly says that an Atheist or a Deist may be allowed to propagate their doctrines, but not a Catholic."

The state of opinion in England to-day is precisely the state of mind of Philagatharches. Toleration is the boast of the country; the removal of disabling statutes from the legislative code is pointed to as the unmistakable token of the highest enlightenment; but persecution, for all that, will not be given up as a principle of State policy. It is not necessary that persecution be linked with physical or social suffering to make it an outrage by man upon man. Moral degradation is as keen in its effects as the pain of the rack or the lash. To affix a stigma upon any one by reason of his religion is to inflict a greater injury on him, because the injury is permanent and enduring, than to condemn him to jail or the triangles and dismiss him after he has worked out his sentence.

The scenes which are being enacted in England to-day are an expression of the sentiments of Philagatharches. The King has had

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

a very humiliating experience. Naturally a tolerant, easy-going man, who has gone through the world for nigh sixty years without giving offense or engaging in polemic, he has had to pass through the Caudine Forks of an instrument forged in the days of Titus Oates in the shape of a test oath. By the terms of the Constitution—or rather the Declaration of Rights—before he could open Parliament he was obliged to read and subscribe to a shocking denunciation of the religious belief of a very large proportion of his subjects and hundreds of millions of Christians outside. The scene was trebly degrading. It degraded the monarch who was obliged to give utterance to the deadly insult; it degraded, or was intended to degrade, the Catholic nobility and gentry and populace in the British Isles; and it degraded the framers of the insult as persons incapable of any real religious or humane feeling, because the essence of the Christian religion is charity toward your neighbor and tenderness for his honest convictions and modes of expressing them. A gorgeous scene, we are told, was that of the opening of Parliament by the new monarch. A scene of abasement and shame, we should rather say. The King, we are told by a High-church organ, read the insulting passages in the oath in a low voice—a token that he was ashamed of them. In his heart he was probably saying what Daniel O’Connell said of a similar oath tendered to him in Parliament: “One-half of it I know to be false; the other I believe to be untrue.”

It is one of the most singular facts in regard to the oath or declaration now causing such a stir that while it attacks the chief doctrines held by the Catholics, it makes no profession of faith in regard to Protestant doctrine. It is true that in the form of declaration presented to the monarch at the coronation ceremony, words appear affirming adherence to “the Protestant reformed religion established by law,” but no allusion is made, direct or indirect, to the doctrines held by that Church. Can imagination picture anything more grotesque, more puerile, more ostrich-like, than this cowardly attempt to evade responsibility by attacking systems which never displayed a like temerity? The Catholic religion is an affirmative religion. What it believes, and what it requires of its children to believe, it states in explicit terms. We defy any member of the Anglican Church to state in precise terms what it believes and what it really means by anything it pretends to state as articles of faith, beyond the declaration of faith in a triune God and the sacrament of baptism. Is the denial of what others hold as Christian creed to be regarded as a just equivalent for a substantial alternative belief? How many negatives are required to construct a single positive?

The purpose of the framers of this oath was malign. Like all people actuated by malice, they were rendered so stupid as to be unable to realize that their malice was transparent. They desired not only to insult the belief of Catholics and the Head of the Catholic Church, but the royal personage to whom it was proffered. These are the exact words of the ingenious contrivance:

"I, A. B., by the Grace of God, King (or Queen) of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely in the Presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

In other words, the royal person to whom this form of abjuration is tendered is told by implication that he or she is one capable of making such mental reservation, and would do so if circumstances so seemed to require, were it not for the safeguard provided by this super-cunning cobweb of formula. The population of Lilliput pinning Lemuel Gulliver down with threads and pegs was not more farcical than the idea of the oath-builders that in practical matters their contrivances would be of any use. Queen Victoria, as an illustration, at her coronation took another oath, or declaration which she swore to solemnly on the Gospels, to the effect that she would maintain the Protestant Church, as by law established, in England and Ireland. Thirty years afterwards she signed the bill disestablishing that Church as far as Ireland was concerned, without asking anybody to absolve her from her solemn oath. "Good manners, Kate, must curtsy to great Kings."

In the case of Queen Victoria the tendering of such an oath was denounced by the famous Dr. Lingard as "both cruel and indecorous," considering her youth and that want of judgment and inquiry into the subject which so solemn an undertaking necessarily demanded as a condition precedent. How could such a young girl as she take it on herself to say that any doctrines were "superstitious and idolatrous" when she had had no opportunity of examining into them? If she did have such an opportunity, was her judgment so ripe as to justify her in coming to a decision on such a solemn subject?

"Toleration combined with a love of persecution" characterizes

the attitude of the British Government toward this stupid heirloom of the Stuarts. When Lord Salisbury had his attention called to the protest of the Catholic peers, he admitted that the terms of the oath were offensive, but added that the wishes of those who demanded security for the Established Church should be respected! Where is the security in compelling Protestants to swear what they believe or do not believe regarding the belief of Catholics? Of what value is any man's opinion on the objective character of certain beliefs subjectively held by others? A man might with as much sanity and rationality swear to what he believes to be the characteristics of the flora and fauna of the Southern Pole as to the objective value of a religious belief into whose foundations and doctrines he has had no opportunity of inquiring. Lord Salisbury is too well-educated a man to believe that the dogmas of the Catholic Church are either blasphemous or idolatrous, but he does not wish to stir the sleeping dogs of Orangeism and Nonconformist bigotry; therefore he will not say that persecution must cease outright. The susceptibilities of bigotry must be tenderly regarded in any modification that may be proposed.

What is this Protestant Reformed Church which the monarch is compelled to swear to support before the crown can be assumed? "Two honorable gentlemen assert," said Edmund Burke, "that if you alter her symbols you destroy the Church of England. This, for the sake of the liberty of that Church, I absolutely deny. The Church, like everybody corporate, may alter her laws without changing her identity. As an independent Church, professing fallibility, she has claimed a right of acting without the consent of any other; as a Church she claims, and has always exercised, a right of reforming whatever appeared amiss in her doctrine, her discipline, or her rites. She did so when she shook off the Papal supremacy in the reign of Henry the Eighth, which was an act of the body of the English Church as well as of the State (I do not inquire how obtained). She did so when she twice changed the liturgy in the reign of King Edward, when she then established articles which were themselves a variation from former professions. She did so when she cut off three articles from her original 42 and reduced them to the present 39; and she certainly would not lose her corporate identity nor subvert her fundamental principles though she were to leave ten out of the 39 which remain out of any future confession of her faith. She would limit her corporate powers, on the contrary, and she would oppose her fundamental principles, if she were to deny herself the prudential exercise of such capacity of reformation."

An independent Church, professing fallibility! What a subtle satirist was the great Edmund as he posed as the defender of this

wonderful "corporation!" "Capacity for transformation" he should have said, not reformation. And it is to the maintenance of this wonderful construction that the English Sovereigns are pledged—an undertaking just as rational as the condemnation of doctrines of which they know nothing whatsoever! How they can be supposed to maintain and defend what is always in a process of mutation they do not pause to inquire. The fetish rites which accompany the inauguration of a Congo chief might easily be more intelligible than the oath and the declaration exacted by law from the British sovereign before he is invested with the insignia of royal power.

Lord Salisbury is a descendant of the statesman, Burghley, who was the chief adviser of Queen Elizabeth. It is curious to trace the similarity of policy between these two Cecils separated by an interval of three hundred years. When Father Campian and twelve other priests were condemned to death on a trumped-up charge of conspiracy against the Queen, many people said that it was at least impolitic to kill so many Catholics on the scaffold at the time when the Duke of Anjou, a Catholic prince, was in London as a suitor for the sovereign's hand. Burghley met this sensible objection by the plea that "it was necessary to allay the apprehensions of the Protestants." Much as Cecil loved lenity and toleration, he loved persecution more—for the sake of the Protestant interest. The same tenderness for that particular interest is clearly seen in his descendant of to-day. Elizabeth, Burghley would have the world believe, was so devoted to that interest that she did not shrink from sacrificing her dearest personal feelings, in running the risk of offending the suitor whom she loved unfeignedly—as she had given him reason to know—in order to demonstrate it. What a master of finesse was the statesman who established a reputation for vast wisdom on the strength of taciturnity and a habit of shaking the head! Nobody was very certain about Elizabeth's religion. She was never very certain about it herself. All she was sure of was that she was the head of the Church, and this Church was in a chrysalis state. To prove her unequivocal attachment to it, therefore, by a sublime act of self-sacrifice seemed to Burghley an opportunity not to be lost. And so ten of the thirteen priests went on hurdles to Tyburn to suffer the ferocious punishment of treason according to old English law.

Is it not more than ordinarily curious to recall that the real beginning—the *fons et origo malorum*—was celebrated by a Mass—the very same mystery of worship which is now consigned to perdition by the terms of the royal oath? At dawn, on the 25th of January, 1532, one of the chaplains of King Henry VIII., Dr. Rowland Hill, received an order to celebrate Mass in a certain room in Whitehall Palace, and there he found the King, with attendants, on the one

side, and the Lady Anne Boleyn, with other attendants, on the opposite. Perceiving that it was a Nuptial Mass that he was expected to celebrate, the priest demurred, as the quarrel between the Pope and the King had not, so far as he knew, been composed. But his fears were stilled by a lie from the lips of the King. He assured the chaplain that the Pope had pronounced in his favor in the matter of the divorce from Queen Catherine, and that he (the King) had the Pope's document on the subject in his own private apartments. This fraudulent marriage was gone through with the object of shielding the already shattered reputation of the bride, and in eight months after its celebration the woman was delivered of a child, who in time became famous as Queen Elizabeth and infamous as the author of the laws which declared the Mass which was invoked to sanctify her unlawful conception and to legitimize her coming birth was blasphemous and idolatrous, and so to brand her parents as persons on a level with pagans in matters of religious belief. There appears to be a peculiar appositeness, therefore, in the circumstances attending the genesis of the anti-Catholic oath. Fraud and sin were present at its cradle; the sinful child of that fraud and sin was the agent and originator of the persecution of which it was the verbal expression. Everything unhallowed shed its influence over the sinister festival. Broken marital faith, base dissimulation, insatiable sensuality, brutal injustice, sickening hypocrisy—all these on the part of the royal bigamist, combined with ambition and uncontrollable passion on the part of the frail mother to render the furtive nuptials a ceremony attended by the rejoicing of the fiends rather than one meriting the blessing of heaven.

After the mockery of a divorce by Cranmer, Henry and Anne were again married, lest the coming issue of their cohabitation should be pronounced as born out of wedlock. Cranmer's connection with these proceedings and the subsequent religious overthrow has all the fitness of a great tragedy. In special was he a proper adjunct of transactions which eventuated in the formulation of abjuratory calumnies against the doctrines hitherto accepted by the whole of Europe. When Cranmer was called to the archbishopric there had been no open rupture between the Pope and Henry, and so his nomination was ratified by the Holy Father and the necessary bulls were forwarded prior to the consecration. He was fully aware of the strained relations which subsisted between the Pope and the King because of the divorce proceedings as well as the question of Papal supremacy, and had made up his mind to sustain the cause of the monarch as against the claims of the spiritual Head of the Church Universal. Therefore, when the time came to act he went, with a notary and witnesses, into the chapter-house at Westminster and



made a formal declaration that in the oath of obedience to the Pope which he was about to take, as required by the existing law, he did not bind himself to anything contrary to the law of God, to the rights of the King, or the intention of any reforms which the latter might find necessary to institute in the Church in England. Then, after this attempt to liberate himself from the responsibility for intended perjury, he marched straightway to the high altar of the cathedral and took the pontifical oath, after declaring in the presence of the same witnesses that he adhered to the reservation he had declared in the chapter-house. It is not surprising that a prelate whose conscience would permit him to juggle thus with the most solemn protestations that man can take had prepared himself for the downward path by breaking loose from the bonds of the priesthood in other respects. Cranmer had thrown off the restraints of celibacy as he had pre-determined to throw off his allegiance to the See of Peter. He had been married twice in his life and left his second wife behind him in Germany when the news of his appointment came to him. But he seems to have concealed the fact from the King, who, with that singular inconsistency which marked his conduct in his later years, had always insisted on enforcing the canonical rule in the matter of clerical celibacy, and even punished violators of it with death.

When, therefore, the framers of the present oath of abjuration are blamed for tagging to it the declaration disclaiming mental reservation on the ground of a Papal dispensation to that end, it must be remembered that they had ample justification in Cranmer's case. Cranmer's trick imposed on nobody but himself. His protest that he did not intend to be bound by what he was about to swear he would be bound by was that sort of device which in popular parlance is styled "cheating the devil in the dark." To compel the English sovereigns to swear that they shall not be guilty of the perfidy and perjury of Cranmer is the worst insult that could well be offered to mortal. And so the framers of that form stand convicted of such crass stupidity as not to be able to perceive that they were guilty of something very like high treason in thus insulting the head of the realm and the head of the Church of England.

We hear the reproach of casuistry and jesuitry frequently flung at the professors and teachers of the Catholic faith. Where can be found so gross an example of casuistry as Cranmer's? Of a piece with the performance at Westminster was the play between Henry and himself which followed quickly upon that event. Knowing full well that the reason why the King made him an archbishop was that he desired his services in the matter of the divorce, he sat down to pen a letter intended to show that he was quite ignorant of the

motive of his elevation. This document was written for the world and for history, but it was so transparently tricky that it served no purpose but to show what a simpleton after all was this super-subtle simulacrum of a cleric. How the grim Tudor must have smiled when he read the missive imploring him to quash all fears of a dispute over the succession, and asking him was it his royal will and pleasure that the question of the divorce should be heard in the archiepiscopal court! The King, to do him justice, was not insensible to the ludicrous aspect of this transaction. The comedy was too broad: the playwright was compelled to mend his hand. He was made to write a second letter couched in terms more suitable to Henry's part in the comedy. The Archbishop was put in the position of a man taking a bold step on his own responsibility. The King was urged as a matter of duty to put an end to the uncertainty regarding the succession, which was said to be a source of grave anxiety and a menace to the peace of the world, by having his cause heard and determined before the primatial see; and the petitioner was made to declare before heaven—he was quite an adept by this time in making these awful protestations—that he had no object whatever in making the request but the benefit of the realm and the relief of his own conscience. The precautions taken by him to prevent Queen Catherine from getting any word of the intended proceeding, at the same time, attested the sincerity of this almost sacramental protestation. The farce was completed by the finding of the tribunal of partisan theologians and canonists and the pronouncement of the divorce decree by the forsworn Archbishop.

In the drama of perfidy in high places thus opened we behold the real beginnings of the royal oath scandal. Although no word about doctrine had as yet been spoken, although the King was still as firm a Catholic in matters of faith as he ever had been, the soil was being prepared for the sowing of heresy's seed. Even when the Pope had set aside the decree of Cranmer's court and the English Parliament had by statute severed the connection between Rome and the English Church, the question of doctrine was not involved; the independent Church still remained Catholic, in its own view, although separated from the general body and the head of Catholicity. The infant Elizabeth, who was destined afterwards to pronounce the religion of her father and mother blasphemous and idolatrous, was baptized duly in that religion. But it is instructive to follow the developments which quickly ensued, for no lesson is more palpable than that which they teach, that one act of disobedience to lawful authority entails a host of evils whose destructive course is irresistible even to the hand which has opened the flood-gates. Passions which had not as yet revealed themselves, or lain

dormant, in the King's nature now began to operate; and when once the Sovereign sets the example, we all know how dutiful subjects deem it right to comport themselves. If the King have a hump, then round shoulders are found to be part of the line of beauty in the human form; if the Queen limp, then a mincing gait becomes the standard of feminine locomotion. Avarice seized upon the mind of Henry—a mind relaxed and dulled to moral perceptions from a long course of sensual indulgence and the uncontrolled assertion of its own variable will. In the transfer of the spiritual authority to himself he beheld a source of revenue which must secure him immunity, for his whole lifetime, from the trouble and worry of extorting money from unwilling parliaments; and he had those about him whose greedy eyes had long been noting the extent and the richness of the lands attached to the great abbeys and monasteries and the generosity of the resources which enabled the abbot and the monk to feed and clothe whole armies of the indigent and enfeebled day after day. Step by step went King and Parliament down the steep slope of Avernus, totally unable now to arrest the pace or check the increasing momentum of the descent. The new ecclesiastical situation required a new oath for bishops, clergy and office-holders; and in the test then drawn up we discern the embryo of the thing that has since evolved in such direful and shocking form—an incantation that makes the sincere and sensitive Catholic shrink as from a whisper from the damned. The bishops were required to swear that they abjured the supremacy of the Pope and acknowledged only that of the monarch; and they were also required, in doing so, to abstain from following the trick of Cranmer, in reserving anything in their minds or availing of any prior dispensation to do or say anything contrary to the oath of supremacy.

Whether or not Cranmer had any part in the construction of this new test is a point on which history is silent: the probability is that he was one of those who assisted in its composition. In that case, he must have been the possessor of a mind singularly apathetic on the subject of personal guiltiness, since he did not fail to condemn in others that of which he himself had, in the knowledge of living witness, been guilty.

It is not in human power to devise a form of abjuration applicable to every phase of society and every successive era, and as Henry desired to cover the present as well as the future, it became necessary, in order to effect his monstrous purposes, to devise a catalogue of specific disavowals designedly framed to ensnare the most prominent men who had opposed, as a conscientious duty, the divorce of the King. These men, Henry knew, were of that inflexible integrity that they could never be got to acknowledge his iniquitous

claim to spiritual supremacy. Chief among these intended victims were the illustrious More and the early tutor of Henry, the saintly Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. The oath of supremacy which was tendered to these two was accompanied by the side statements that there was no power on earth competent to dispense within the degrees of kin prohibited in the book of Leviticus, and that the marriage of Catherine and Henry had from the beginning been unlawful and void. Other declarations and denials were tacked on to the oath from time to time by the King, to suit other phases of his war on Pope and Church; but in the case of More and Fisher, the great object sought was indicated in the two statements to which they were asked to subscribe, and by subscribing to which they might have saved their lives. The particular stress laid on this, in the cases of these two eminent men, was prompted by the knowledge of the high esteem in which they were held, not only at home, but on the continent of Europe, because of their integrity and wisdom; and if only Henry could boast that they had acknowledged that they were wrong in their opposition to his criminal conduct, he would have gained a great moral—or rather immoral—victory. It is necessary to observe the sort of double-action in ethics employed in connection with these momentous events, in order to gain a true estimate of their infernal cunning and unscrupulousness. We have seen how the King's Archbishop absolved his conscience from the guilt of an intended perjury, having no sanction for his conduct but his own pre-determination to do wrong: we behold, in the hectoring tone and shallow arguments adopted by Henry's tool, Cromwell, toward the dignified ex-Chancellor, an attempt to deceive one's self with similar idle sophistry. More had been pressed by his judges—if one may so call them without degrading the idea of the judicial office—to give his reasons for refusing to take the oath. He had pleaded that he feared his doing so would give offense. Had he an assurance from the King that he would not give offense, he said, he would state why he objected. Whereupon Cromwell interposed with the bold equivocation that even the King's warrant would not save him from the penalties of the statute by which the oath was prescribed. An exquisite specimen of sophistry, truly, seeing that it was the King who had got the statute enacted, and that the men who enacted it knew that if they refused they would lose their heads. To assume that the work was superior in authority to the artificer shows a novelty in argument quite of a piece with the childish self-deception initiated by Cranmer. And all through the long series of conflicting alternations that marked the gestation of the Anglican Church may be traced the same spirit of self-deceptive reasoning. The work was accepted as superior in authority to the hand that

made it; the religion and the civilization that had been bestowed by Rome were assumed to be above and independent of the bestower. How grotesque an idea that a self-amputated limb carries with it the vitality and energy and will-power of the trunk from which it has been disparted!

More and Fisher frustrated the King's design to use them as witnesses for the justice of his cause; and his deep chagrin is perceptible in the energy with which retaliatory measures were pushed forward thenceforth against the Church. His suspicions were not allayed with every new declaration he wrung from weaker prelates. Month after month he hedged himself and his successors around with fresh barbed-wire affirmatives; and, taking Cranmer as a type, rather than Fisher, he carefully exacted from each prelate a declaration that he had not saved himself from a perjury by a reservation like Cranmer's. Foolish man to think that such a device would secure the allegiance of any one worth having! If the power of mental reservation is such as to impose upon one's own conscience, what limit can be placed upon that power? One has nothing to do but to add reservation to reservation, in order to escape from any dilemma, no matter how bewildering, with which conscience may be confronted.

The extraordinary delusion that even the thought of man may be controlled by acts of parliament was amongst the monstrous products of this period of heretical parturition. It is truly wonderful to look back on the series of enactments solemnly debated and passed by successive sets of men, popular representatives as they were fictitiously described, the central idea of all being that the power of the Crown and the law-making authority was competent to coerce not merely the human conscience, but even the secret action of the mind itself. For instance: It was taken as a proof of internal malice—that is, the secret conviction of the mind—that a man should refuse to acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the monarch; and to “wish or will” maliciously anything injurious or derogatory to the King, or to style him a schismatic—as he plainly and ostensibly was—or a tyrant—which everybody was now convinced he was—was declared to be high treason, punishable by the horrid butchery of hanging, “drawing” and quartering. Amongst the false charges laid at the door of the Catholic Church is that of nullifying the Divine gift of free will by the assertion of power to control even the involuntary thought and the working of the mind. Here we behold a savage ruler asserting even such a tremendous power as an inherent appanage of secular sovereignty, and exercising the function of supreme spiritual authority—supreme lord of every human being, body and soul, in his realm—even vicariously, and even his vicar

vicariously. We behold him clothing Cromwell with his self-bestowed supreme authority and giving him priority in the councils of archbishops and bishops, and Cromwell's very clerks assuming that power, in Cromwell's absence! Gesler's cap, on high in the market-place of Altorf, was a badge of freedom in comparison with the vicarious ink-horn bearers of his High Mightiness the Lord Cromwell. The Grand Llama of Thibet, upon whose august lineaments no mortal is deemed good enough to look in public, claims nothing in the way of human degradation to be compared with the authority bestowed by King Henry first upon himself and then upon his tool Cromwell, and the whipper-snapper clerks of the same miserable instrument.

It is not strange to find that successful assault upon the spiritual rights of the Church should be followed by another assault on the civil rights of the people. By the terms of the old coronation oaths the principle of consent of the governed was recognized in the form of undertaking proposed to the monarch previous to consecration. From the earliest times of the English monarchy the democratic principle was expressed in the terms of the oath, in the shape of the promise exacted from the King that he would govern justly, in accordance with the laws and customs of England and maintain the privileges of the clergy. When the sanguinary Tudor was called to his dreadful account the cunning hand of Cranmer was again visible in the construction of a modified coronation oath adapted to the new times and the new ideas of monarchy superinduced by the cutting loose from Rome. No longer was it deemed necessary to solicit the acceptance of the sovereign at the hands of the people, according to ancient usage, but the managers of the young King took that acceptance for granted, and he was made to pledge himself to keep the laws and respect the liberties of the people, to keep peace and concord in the Church, to do equal justice, and to make no laws but to the honor of God and the good of the Commonwealth. Having thus cut down the right of the people in the compact between the sovereign and the nation, the crafty-minded ecclesiastic proceeded to undermine the power of conscience in the infantile mind of the King, with all the unscrupulous casuistry of the Serpent in the Garden. While the words to which he had sworn the King still trembled on the air, he, in presence of the Blessed Sacrament on the altar, upon which, it is said, the King had been sworn, proceeded to inform him that his right to rule was derived not from people or Pope, but from God alone; that no power whatever lay in the Bishop of Rome or any other bishop to impose terms upon him, and so forth. Yet, in spite of this assurance of absolute irresponsibility, Cranmer himself proceeded to lay down terms, by telling the

King his duty. Now for the first time we catch a glimpse of the monstrosity which had been long incubating in that dark and tortuous mind. The word which for his life he dared not speak, the thought which for his head he dared not breathe even, to the late King, for all his tyranny and presumption, it was now safe to spring upon the world, for the time was ripe. *Idolatry*, he said, it would be the King's duty to extirpate—the "idolatry" in question being the worship of Christ in the Sacrament on which the monarch had been sworn. What an awful picture of impiety! The human mind is incapable of realizing any treason to God or man more abysmal. The worship which his monarch had just rendered, as pledge of his sincerity in the bargain made between the nation and himself, he heard now cynically described by the priest who led in it as the degradation of paganism—identical with the dark rite of the British druid and the gross superstition of the African barbarian!

Now we have, for the first time in England, official promulgation of Protestantism's cardinal idea. On the Continent it had been broached and preached by the bolder among the so-called reformers, although Luther, with all his hardihood, quibbled about it and tried to compound with the plain words of Christ in the Bible on which the apostate monk was so insistent. But the guilt of the first official denial of Christ in the sacrifice of His love, in the country which had acquired the title of Mary's Dower, belongs to Cranmer. History fails to furnish, from its long roll of arch-hypocrites, any just compeer of Cranmer in versatility of apostasy. When we recall that many and many a one he himself had consigned to the stake for the expression of beliefs which he now denounced as idolatry, we cannot but shudder at the thought of his hideous insensibility to shame or remorse.

After going through this extraordinary performance with respect to the Sacrament and the King, Cranmer, in his character of Archbishop, proceeded to sing High Mass, with all the unction of a genuine pontifical celebrant.

Such, then, was the scene which ushered in a new system in the English sovereignty. The law of Divine right was for the first time enunciated in the civil sphere; the principle of mental reservation in the taking of a solemn oath illustrated and declared just, and the duty of the monarch to become persecutor in spiritual affairs inculcated. It must be owned that every dramatic propriety is visible in the awful sacrilege. From this *point d'appui* to the definite denunciation of certain theological tenets was but a step.

It can hardly be doubted by any dispassionate reader that the material advantages accruing in the first place to the sovereign, and in the next to the counsellors by whom he or she was surrounded,

from the application of test oaths to persons of position and property was a prime factor in the development of spiritual tyranny in these curious products of the new religion. No obscure persons were called upon to subscribe to them; invariably it was to persons high in ecclesiastical rank or influence or those who held great landed estates or valuable movables or personal effects—anything, in short, that might readily be converted into money—that the searching formulæ were tendered. Death or forfeiture was the certain penalty of refusal: in most cases forfeiture went along with the death penalty. Monarchy, in those days, while always extravagant, was always needy; and there were times when it was next to impossible to get money from Parliaments. The modern system of loans on international securities was then unknown; the internal resources of each country were the chief reliance of the Crown for its wars and its costly *entourage*; and when the religious difficulty came, with its unlimited prospect of attainders, we may be certain that it was hailed by royal theologians as a special dispensation for their especial relief. When a man or woman has had the notion firmly rooted in the mind that rule comes by right divine, it is not difficult to conceive how the corollary doctrine that the larger right involves the smaller, that spiritual rule means material ownership, may quickly follow. While the bloated Henry asserted what he fully believed was his heaven-derived right as spiritual lord, he never had the smallest doubt that he was equally justified in filling his coffers and rewarding his minions by the spoliation of all who disputed his outrageous claim. In due time it dawned upon the minds of men, as the system of rule by political parties began to emerge from the long conflict with absolute royal power, that the principle of religious test could be utilized with immense effect in political life; and so we see it begin to take shape as a methodical *modus vivendi*, at a time when the assertion of the royal prerogatives in the matter of recusants' property became alarming even to the parasites who had procured them from Parliament. This was in the reign of James I., when the penal statutes against Catholics assumed a character of ferocity so minute and far-reaching as to draw from the French Ambassador to England the indignant comment that they were characteristic of barbarians rather than Christians. The force of this condemnation will be realized when we reflect that at the time it was uttered persecution of opponents and cruel punishments by torture and imprisonment were the rule and the law universally in vogue. It is little wonder that the Catholics who were in a position to betake themselves out of the kingdom did so, since life was no longer tolerable in it for them. Those who were compelled to remain were split up into two parties, and thus rendered impotent as a political factor,

through the artful machinations of their persecutors. The new oath of allegiance was so cunningly devised as to draw a distinction between those who denied and those who admitted the temporal rights of the Roman See. The former class were decreed exempt from any penalties for recusancy other than those already enacted; while the others were subjected to imprisonment as long as they continued obstinate, besides to forfeiture of both real and personal property. This drastic test was not intended to be a dead letter, or a punishment held *in terrorem* merely. No sooner was it passed into law than it was ordered to be tendered to all those recusants already convicted under previous laws, to all others *suspected* of Catholicity because of non-reception of the Protestant sacrament twice in the year in a church, and to all travelers who were unknown in the parts where they were found. At one blow the King was thus enabled to enrich himself and his followers at the expense of their helpless adversaries, as well as to reap an enormous political advantage by excluding them from both Houses of Parliament and the local magistracy. Divided in opinion, something like a schism arose in the Catholic ranks. Blackwell, the archpriest, who had sworn allegiance to Elizabeth, regarded the new oath as one that might conscientiously be taken, even though it had been condemned by the Pope, and to lead the way took it himself, and in a circular advised his clergy to take it also, in the sense in which it had been explained to him by the Royal Commissioners. This subserviency, while it rent the Catholic body in twain, did not save the archpriest from the malice of his enemies. He was flung into prison, where he languished until his death. Meanwhile James sought to improve his advantage by plunging into the sea of theological discussion in vindication of the oath. While his headsmen and hangman and fagot-men were busy burning and decapitating and disembowelling priests and gentry, he kept his pen busy on dissertations on Antichrist and the Apocalypse as an "Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance," getting them printed, and then tearing them up and trying his hand again. When the effort was over the result was seen in a book, copies of which he sent to various crowned heads as well as to the different English prelates, and whose singular compound of learning and false reasoning, we may surmise, prompted the choice epigram of Sully on the character of James—"the wisest fool in Europe."

Previous to this time the spirit of those safeguarding oaths had been defensive rather than aggressive. In James' case we see a new turn of thought. The head of the realm deems it his duty, as head of the Church of Parliamentary enactment, to assert the functions of theologian and proclaim the King's sway as spiritual lord over the souls and consciences of men. The mind which, fresh from scenes

of disgusting bacchanal debauchery, could enter into a profound disputation with doctors of divinity, then invade the precincts of Satan in an excursus on demoncraft, and then proceed to think out tests and punishments for ancient hags and others suspected of witchcraft, was surely one to deceive itself into the belief that no domain in heaven above or earth beneath was exempt from its influence and authority. Theology he believed to be the highest of sciences, and himself the greatest theologian he knew. Familiarity with canon law led him on to the belief that his position as head of the Church gave him the inherent faculties of the priestly office, if it did not actually, as in the case of Heliogabalus, delude him into the idea that he was a divinity himself. So, in the famous case wherein Archbishop Abbot, while on a hunting party, accidentally shot and killed the keeper of the park, James took on himself the duty of giving him absolution from all irregularity *ad majorem cautelam*, as under the old canon law it was necessary should be done by the highest ecclesiastical authority. When, therefore, he undertook to act in an ecclesiastical function, it is not matter for surprise that he should undertake to define what was heretical with regard to the opinions of his Catholic subjects. It was not alone that they were coerced to deny the deposing power of the Pope, but they must needs also swear that to entertain the belief in this power was "heretical, impious and damnable."

Rapid had been the evolution of the "divine right" idea. Emancipating itself from the tradition of the consent of the governed, by the manipulation of Cranmer, the monarchy, within a century, had also emancipated itself from all spiritual responsibility. The deposing power resided neither with Pope nor people. Boldly assuming that inherent right was sufficient warrant for the assertion of sovereign power, the Crown began that war upon constitutional right which ended only when the head of King Charles rolled from the block. The growth of heresy and civil despotism began at the same hour and were tended by the same hands. It was a despotism, too, more intolerable than that of the Tarquins, since it was not satisfied with absolute sway in temporal concerns, but dared to deal with the concerns of the human soul beyond the grave. When a tyrant sovereign is responsible neither to heaven nor his subjects, there is no escaping from the crux that either slavery or revolution must be the outcome of the situation.

Still, no oath or affirmation that had been as yet proposed went any farther, as a doctrinal utterance, than a repudiation or denial of something. If the process of building up could be furthered by mere demolition, the lineaments of the Anglican Church must have been so well defined that no uncertainty could be entertained re-

garding its expression. But here is the anomaly in the case. While men were again and again asked to avow that they did not believe in this thing or that, no one ventured to suggest an alternative belief. Each monarch swore to defend the faith; yet the faith which one monarch defended was altogether different when his successor appeared to take the same oath. The first attempt to identify "the faith" with a particular Church is found in the coronation oath agreed on by the Parliament which settled the crown on William and Mary after the Revolution of 1688. The sovereign was made to swear, by the terms of this covenant, to uphold "the Protestant religion established by law," but not until after a stiff debate whether the form should not rather be, "as it should be hereafter established by law." But the phrase, "the Protestant religion as established by law" meant nothing or anything, so far as doctrine was concerned. No doubt it had been decreed by the House of Commons, in 1673, that no one should be given public employment, civil or military, who refused to take the oath of supremacy and allegiance and to receive the sacrament "according to the rites of the Church of England." But only ten years before this decree was passed there had been an abortive attempt at the Savoy, the Bishop of London's residence, to revise the Book of Common Prayer, by a commission of clergy from both the Episcopal and the Presbyterian communions, with a view to rendering its meaning intelligible and acceptable to both regular and dissenting Protestants. These learned men, after a very long discussion, found themselves unable to agree upon any form of revision that would fulfil the desired end; and so King Charles was obliged to summon Convocation and get the alterations made perforce by the Established bishops, that he might carry out the undertakings on the subject of toleration given by him to the commissioners at Breda. The Act of Uniformity which was the outcome did nothing more than prescribe certain external forms as to the reception of the sacrament: of the nature and essence of the sacrament itself the recipient might entertain the widest or the narrowest opinion, just as is the case to-day. The fact that many in the Protestant communion still believed in the Real Presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is strikingly shown in the stringent declarations embodied in the Test Act of 1673, and the still more stern one of 1675. Several times during the debates in Parliament over these measures the ministers who proposed them were challenged to state what they really meant. "What," asked the Earl of Shaftesbury, "is the Protestant religion? Where are its boundaries? How are they to be ascertained?" Parliament was asked to compel men to swear that they would not attempt any alteration in a religion the limits of which were unknown. It was in vain that

VOL. XXVI—2

Shaftesbury, Buckingham and other peers sarcastically exposed the inconsistencies of the proposers of these absurd Test Acts, and challenged them to state in terms what doctrines were to be safeguarded. All that was aimed at was to keep Catholics out of the public service, and so the shocking passages about Transubstantiation, copied from earlier Puritan declarations in the reign of Charles I., were inserted in the new tests; and in 1678, owing to the fears of the accession of a Catholic prince, the oath, in its present outrageous form, was extended even to the wearer of the Crown.

The great object of the Test Act of 1673 was to exclude the Duke of York from the succession because he had become a Catholic; and its first effect was to make him resign the office of Lord High Admiral. Lord Clifford, who filled the post of Treasurer, also declined the oath and resigned.

When Titus Oates got up his nefarious scare about a Popish Plot, Parliament was once more invited to turn its attention to the defenses of Protestantism, which no amount of strengthening and buttressing seemed to be able to render secure enough. Then came the bigot Danby with his amended Test Act excluding Catholic peers from Parliament, despite their hereditary privileges, which were regarded as having their roots in the very Constitution. From the Lower House Catholics had been debarred since the time of Queen Elizabeth. But the case was different from that of the peers, whose right to sit and vote by virtue of their descent was an integral portion of the organic law of the realm, as settled since the Conquest.

It must be owned that the apprehensions of the nervous defenders of Protestantism, "as by law established," were not altogether groundless, bearing in mind the shifting foundations on which the structure was raised. Of stability in doctrine or discipline there was none. A process of mutation as constant as the action of the tides on a sand-bar was its normal characteristic. But, independently of the peril possible from this phenomenon, there was also the equally subtle danger of those subterranean streams of mental reservation so forcibly exemplified in the amazing convolutions of Cranmer. A somewhat different order of self-deception, yet one equally ominous of insecurity to framers of armor-clad abjurations, is seen in the case of the Duke of Argyll. To retain him in his office of Justice-General and his hereditary sheriffdoms, from which powerful enemies sought to oust him, the Duke was tendered the oath. After some hesitation he consented to take it subject to an explanation. The explanation was remarkable. He would bind himself by the oath, he said, "only in so far as it was consistent with itself and the Protestant religion, and would not bar himself from en-

deavoring, in a lawful way and in his station, to make such changes in Church and State as he might deem beneficial." Casuistry is often imputed to theologians of the Catholic faith as a dangerous and unlovely peculiarity. The most experienced teacher of the art might not disdain a lesson from this Highland chief, who was the type of a very numerous class that gained for Scotland a reputation for ingenuity at a time when a divided allegiance threatened ruin to the chief landholders of the country. Still, this remarkable instance of logical dexterity was ineffectual to save the Duke. Although it satisfied the Duke of York, Charles and his commissioners were doubtful of such a man's reliability. They saw in his mental attitude an extension of the principle of private judgment in a direction more dangerous far than that of religious faith—the temporal things of the State. So that when he appeared again to qualify as Commissioner of the Treasury and again proffered his explanation when about to take the oath, he was placed under arrest and tried for treason, and only saved his head by disguising his person as he tried to do his thoughts and slipping out of his prison.

No fact is plainer than the falsity of the pretense that those royal oaths and parliamentary tests were devised out of zeal for religion. As we trace them step by step, the material considerations which really prompted their invention are seen developing themselves in growing boldness and definiteness. To oust people of a different kind of conscience from their lands and possessions, to garner up political power in the one direction so securely that the men gradually getting the upper hand could reckon on its possession permanently for themselves and their descendants; to use these tests for the Machiaveillian purpose of setting Catholic against Catholic, son against father, brother against brother, wife against husband, and so to gradually stamp out the old religion from the face of the land—these were the real purposes of the Coronation Oath and the Parliamentary and official tests. We have this sardonic purpose openly avowed by many of those engaged in the furtherance of it. Strafford set up the Court of Wards in Ireland in order to carry it out, and he tells us so with the frankest cynicism in his own papers. He wanted the estates of the old Catholic nobility for the King's use, and so he seized the heirs when they were minors, sent them to be trained in some Protestant den, and kept them from their inheritance until they would "conform," the court meanwhile getting the "livery" of their lands. He quotes a remarkable instance of his success in this policy in the case of the Earl of Ormond, "who, if bred under the wings of his own parents," he observes, "had been of the same affections and religion his brothers and sisters are; whereas now he is a firm Protestant."

The subtle mind which devised this policy was not in all cases at fault. While many of the old native Catholic families stood firm, newcomers like the Butlers and Fitzgeralds at length succumbed. Ormond was so successfully imbued with the virus of anti-Catholicism and denationalization that he is found later on practising on others the same insidious arts as he had himself been ensnared by. In a letter quoted by Carte, speaking of a declaration adopted by a Catholic synod, which was copied from the Gallican Church, he says his aim in rejecting it was "to work a division among the Romish clergy;" and "I believe I had accomplished it, to the great security of the government and the Protestants and against the opposition of the Pope and his creatures and nuncios, if I had not been removed."

It was in Ireland that this remorseless policy was mostly exerted in all its unnatural malice. By means of it and of the wars to which it gave birth as the centuries rolled on, the land of Ireland was three times confiscated. But its religion never was. It is there to-day, as firmly rooted as ever; and, by a singular fitness in retribution, it was by an Irish hand that the oath of perjury and blasphemy was dashed to pieces in the midst of the shrine wherein it was forged. It is now only taken by a "Defender" of the Faith which it was designed to destroy; and its effectiveness is seen in the fact that the monarch just passed away had no hesitation in signing the death warrant of the Established Church in Ireland, which under its terms she pledged herself to uphold as solemnly as she repudiated the "idolatry" of Transubstantiation.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

AN OLD-IRISH MONASTERY IN THE APENNINES.

I.

ONE summer day, in August of 1897, it fell to the lot of the writer to find himself on a pilgrimage to the little and almost inaccessible town of Bobbio that lies hidden away in the innermost folds of the mighty Apennines. I had left my traveling companions at Milan and made my way to Piacenza, whose streets of fortress-like palaces seemed doubly sombre and mysterious at that midnight hour which found me knocking at the gate of an ancient hostelry. A kindly and courteous welcome, such as one usually meets in out-of-the-way Italian towns, added to the comfort of a few

hours' sleep, too soon broken by the necessity of catching the first train that pulled out for Rivergaro about four in the morning. For more than three hours I shivered in the open tramway car that sped with great rapidity over the level fields of the Placentine territory, amid vineyards and olive groves and orchards, by tiny hamlets clustered around ancient churches, over rivers and creeks arched romantically by willows and sycamores and wild native shrubberies, through ancient towns whose corner-stones were laid by some prehistoric Italiots, and whose archives are gray with age, perhaps rusty with a thousand stains of blood and conflict. It was painful to fly like a thoughtless bird across the plains of

"fruitful Lombardy,
The pleasant garden of great Italy."

It was more painful to know that we were skimming so rapidly across one of the world's greatest battle-fields, where, between two seas and under the shadow of the highest Alps, the original contentions of our remotest Aryan ancestors were fought out; where the mercenaries of Hannibal overthrew Scipio and Sempronius (B. C. 218); where a thousand mediæval conflicts had been fought; where the Russian Suwarrow repulsed Macdonald in 1799, and for one hour checked the victorious flight of the Napoleonic eagles. Here, too, was initiated one phase of the great mediæval struggle of Church and Empire—that wonderful mixed conflict of the powers political and spiritual that is not yet off the stage. On the Plain of Roncaglia, near Piacenza, in 1158, Frederic I. promulgated the Code of Justinian with all its absolutistic Cæsaropapism as the future fundamental law of Christendom. This suggestion of his Bologna law school was the opening scene of the second number in the marvelous trilogy of mediæval struggles that centres about the names of Henry IV., Frederick I. and Philip the Fair. How little men foresaw in the time of Dante, when the fierce Ghibelline poet still recalled with joy

lo imperio del buon Barbarossa
Di cui dolente ancor Milan ragiona,

what should be the outcome of the world-shattering duel between these Kings of the Rhineland and the priesthood of Rome! The Kings are dust in the lonely vaults of Speyer, where their marble statues, crowned and sceptred, keep solemn ward in the great basilica; but the Bishops of Rome are still a central influence in the affairs of Europe, though it is now, politically, antipodal to the system and the ideals of the Hohenstaufen. Here Spaniard, Frenchman, German, Swiss and Austrian—the whole horde that old Pope Julius, with a genuine Renaissance temper, called the barbarians—have in more modern times held sway, for a briefer or longer period;

yet what remains of the "forestieri" to-day? Is there not something indomitable in the immemorial racial instincts of a population rooted to the soil and feeding forever on its own ideals as incarnated in history, monuments, letters?

The sun was high when we brought up with a clatter at Rivergaro, a picturesque Lombard hamlet, with its feet in the glorious plain and its back long drawn out upon rising slopes that are as the first rung of the great ladder of mountains whose top is the snowy crown of Mount Blanc. Here I was bundled into a "diligenza," or old-fashioned Italian express coach, not of the Concord type, nor, again, like the archaic vehicles that run yet between Rome and the neighboring hill towns, rather a comfortable and secure conveyance, with perch upon perch and pocket upon pocket, truly a stout equipment for the long journey that stretches between Rivergaro and Bobbio.

How good it was up there beside the driver, even if he was merciless to the poor "bestie" as they toiled up every winding steep and rattled down every long hillside to the music of a grinding brake that alone stood between us and the sulfureted torrent that whirled beneath in a mimic fury of white loam and green waves! The splendid road, so broad and firm, shining in its dress of crushed lime-stone that the peasants replenish constantly from the little blueish heaps that are piled up at intervals, gave back a sense of security. Over there, across the deep and narrow valley that often took on the character of a cañon or gulch, arose sweep above sweep of naked rock—the gaunt gray peaks of the Apennines. It was oppressive to gaze long at this wilderness of stone hung there in the upper air, every convolution and boss and ravine brought out by the accusing sunlight. Right and left, at every turn in the long journey, these massive ramparts of the peninsula glowered down upon us. Occasionally patches of oak and chestnut broke the fierce monotony of these stony "rafters of Italy," and again, a shepherd's hut or his browsing sheep. The distant tinkling of their bells, the thin fine note of some cowherd's pipe, relieved from time to time the white stillness that lay upon all nature save for the brawling of the torrent as it caught up forever and ground the fresh masses of limestone that were forever crumbling down into its remorseless mill. Not unfrequently a whitewashed chapel rose against the blue line of the horizon, some lonely mission station telling of a divine presence, of God's interest in the scattered herdsmen, of the long journeyings and fastings of their good clergy.

On the lowest slopes, however, vegetation was abundant. The vine and the olive grow poorly enough. Now, as of old, the wines of the Apennines are weak and thin; there is in them no melted sunlight of the South. These are cold and stern regions. We are moving

through the heart of ancient Liguria, not the maritime Liguria, but the Liguria of the mountains. Here, between Genoa and Pisa, lay of old those almost autochthonous tribes which came so slowly under the yoke of Rome. Neighbors, perhaps kinsmen, to the Gauls beyond the Po, they outlived in their rude independence of shepherds and hunters the liberties of the Roman Republic and yielded only under Augustus. They had long been the Swiss of the Roman State, mercenaries for every power that would pay them, from Carthage to Athens, distrustful of the intentions of the Golden Queen by the Tiber, "montani, duri, agrestes," as Cicero called them. A hundred years of warfare in the last century of the Republic had made its soldiers familiar with the long-haired mountaineers, agile as their own wild goats, sure-eyed slingers, an invaluable foot auxiliary, sober and frugal, their few "impedimenta" neatly cinched on the backs of dwarf horses or mules, their oblong shields of brass hung loosely at their backs. Then, as now, life was a severe discipline for the hill-man of the Apennines. Vergil, in the *Georgics*, speaks of the "assuetum malo Ligurem," the Ligurian broken to all hardships. The ancients used to say that these mountaineers quarried the soil rather than dug it, and we may well believe them, for the fertile terraces that stretch up the lower belt of the mountains have been created by the industry of centuries and are saved only by the continuous care of each generation. An intelligent irrigation, watchful buttressing of the sunniest exposures, steady repression of the gnawing tooth of multitudinous torrents, are now as needed as in the days when Polybius and Strabo described these hills.

In antiquity this constant toil had its reward. The classic writers speak of the numerous small towns and prosperous hamlets that lay scattered through the Ligurian and Emilian hills. Vergil, notably, dwells on this Apennine scenery, where

"Many a peopled city towers around,
And many a rocky cliff with castle crowned,
And many an antique wall whose hoary brow
O'ershades the flood that guards its base below."

I wondered, as we held our way along and against the shrunken torrent of the Trebbia, how much of this old Ligurian blood had come down to the peasantry of the surrounding scenes. Since those days when the republic was satisfied with a fair roadway through the heart of the mountain tribes, as the result of two centuries of stubborn warfare, what vicissitudes has not Northern Italy undergone! From Genoa to Venice every valley, every mountain pass, every hillside, has been overrun by some fierce German tribe drawn southward by the fatal gift of Italian beauty. Goth and Schwab and Herul and Lombard swarmed in this region for fully two hundred years ere they finally settled down as peaceful tillers of the soil. But

long before them the Keltic blood of those Gauls who became naturalized on the same site had mingled with the aboriginal strain, or as much of it as had not spent itself in the endless wars with the Republic.

"Ah me! What armed nations—Asian horde
And Lybian host, the Scythian and the Gaul—
Have swept your base and through your passes poured!
Like ocean tides uprising at the call
Of tyrant winds, against your rocky base
The bloody billows dashed and howled and died."

Perhaps we shall never know the conditions of this wonderful and providential amalgamation, this smelting of many races in one strong deep current. Later historians of Europe maintain that the Gallo-Roman blood absorbed the rich Frankish contingent; that the genuine Greek of classical times found a way in his walled towns to perpetuate an untainted blood in spite of Slav and Avar and Bulgar. It may, therefore, be that yonder shepherd whose silhouette bars the horizon is a genuine son of an Italian race whose origins are lost in nebulous myth and archaic saga.

My companions are some men and women from the picturesque hamlets that we met upon our way. A few had come from distant Piacenza, the rim of their social horizon. But they were kindly and gossipy, quite curious about the "Americano," when they learned his nationality, full of startling questions about the great Western world that came before them in all the hues and outlines of Paradise. They chattered among themselves about the probable purpose of one who had come from the depths of the West to their lonely and uninteresting mountains. In their vigorous and picturesque dialect that holds yet some echo, some savor of the old Vergilian tongue, they proclaimed him a man

"*Qui multorum hominum mores vidit et urbes.*"

In their manner and speech, it seemed to me, there was something of an old-time innocence and simplicity of life, as of men and women whose imagination had never been stirred, and whose interests and passions were bounded and conditioned by these walls and towers of granite that encircled their existence from an immemorial day. Not otherwise did Nausicaa and Alcinous, their Phæacian counselors and peers, listen to the storm-tossed Ulysses as he recited in their presence the moving chapters of his great woe. When, finally, I declared that I was only a poor pilgrim to the shrine of San Colombano at Bobbio, and that I belonged, by descent, to the same race that had sent this good and holy man to them so long ago, I felt that the mystery had fallen away from me. I was even like one of themselves, an intelligible being, one who fitted every way into their ideas and experiences. Sicuro! it was a wise and correct thing

to come to San Colombano. Yearly multitudes still came from the hill-towns of Ottone and Varzo and Zavattarello, from Pregola and Cerignale and Corte Brugnatella. Indeed, from great cities like Genoa and Pavia men and women came occasionally to the holy shrine. Yes! he was a "Scozzese," and "Irlandese." Every child in Bobbio knew that. And he had been a "prince" in that land, they thought. Only a short while ago there had come bishops and priests out of Ireland to pray at the tomb of their "Santo." Was he still good and powerful? What a question! Every cabin in these hills had been blessed by him. Every shepherd and peasant loved him as a father; the young and the old revered him. Clearly I had come upon loyal clients of the marvelous old Irishman. They had misty notions of time and space, it is true, but between their primitive paganism and their actual Christianity loomed up to-day, as thirteen centuries ago, the figure of the Christian priest who had made his way hither from the banks of Lough Earne and the precincts of thrice holy Bangor. On every side rose the wrecks of mediæval castles, but the fame of Columbanus was already old when their walls were first raised by Lombard nobles, like human eyries upon every gray crag and inaccessible peak that pierced the cloudless blue above us. And now, at the end of the nineteenth century, that fame was still fresh and sweet, like the heart of cedar, in that still more incorruptible casket, the heart of man. As our "diligenza," after many changes of horses, climbed the last slopes and rounded the last angles that hid the view of this miniature Holy Land, these good "Bobbies" turned often my attention to various landmarks connected with the dwelling and work of San Colombano in their secluded valley. Historical truth and decorative legend were, of course, intertwined in their speech. But who would rob them of their legends would surely plunder the robin's nest, pluck the ivy from the ruined wall, violate his father's ashes—in a word, be guilty of any horrid impiety against the gentle amenities and sweet compensations of life. That day, at least, my temper was in no such iconoclastic mood, and San Colombano surely counted me in with his legitimate brood as we reached the long stone bridge that spans the shallow bed of the Trebbia. With its many arches of varying size and shape, its quaint ascending and descending slopes, it brought to my mind the bridge in Bürger's great ballad:

"Auf Pfeilern und auf Bogen schwer,
Aus Quaderstein von unten auf
Lag eine Brücke drüber her,
Und mitten stand ein Häuschen drauf."

Now, at last, we were on the level ground of the little plain of Bobbio, a kind of clearing some four miles square and the only one of such size that the jealous Trebbia has tolerated from its source in

the near mountains to its issue from those foot hills of the Apennines that are visible from Piacenza. Did worldly business or pleasure invite us we should scarcely rest here, but pursue our way to "Genoa the Superb," the queenliest city of these regions, some sixty miles away. A fair road, old and much used, lay before us, and at its end the palaces and markets, the great churches, galleries and villas of the city of the Dorias and the Balbis, its white-sailed ships from many ports and its elegant caravansaries where meet daily the streams of travel converging upon Milan and Florence and Rome. Bobbio, on the contrary, is forever a most unworldly spot, a little green paradise, rimmed by solemn mountains, a natural home of piety and learning, a kind of backwater along the swift stream of human life as it bears its miscellaneous freight through the centuries. I had come a long way, in loving respect and veneration to feast my eyes upon the site that could fascinate a Columbanus and to grant my heart the comfort of one day's dwelling amid scenes of antique piety to God and devotion to humanity. And so when our chatty and picturesque postillion cried cheerily to his horses and rattled over the stony streets into the little mediæval piazza and set me down in presence of a portly but gentle Boniface in the very doorway of his inn, I experienced a delight known only to those who have the "passion" of the past.

II.

Perhaps there is no better proof of the passing of the old Græco-Roman social order in the course of the sixth century, at least in the West, than the presence and function of such an Irishman as Saint Columbanus in the heart of Northern Italy, almost at the gate of Milan, one of ancient Italy's richest towns, second only to Rome, when the City was in its golden prime. This saint is surely the most famous, also the most influential of that memorable band of apostles who went forth from the Island of Saints and Doctors between the years A. D. 500 and 800 to restore or establish Christianity along the smoking pathways of barbarism, and to create those centres of learning and education whence the episcopal schools of the later middle ages should draw their models, their inspiration—very often their school books—the art of writing, and that skill in illumination to which our modern art historians now refer the first independent origins of Western mediæval painting and sculpture.

A full century, indeed, before the coming of Columbanus upon the Continent other Irish saints had made their way thither. The most renowned is Saint Fridolin, of royal race in Ireland, originally a domestic missionary, then Abbat of All Hallows in Poitiers, friend

and counsellor of King Clovis, zealous rebuilder of the great basilica of Saint Hilary of Poitiers, finally missionary to the Alamanni of Baden and founder of the Old-Irish monastery of Säckingen on the Rhine-island of that name. Fridolin is a real hyphen between the perishing classicism of the West and its embryonic mediævalism. Nor is his influence departed; his portrait is yet in the blason of the Swiss canton of Glarus, and pilgrims from Ireland yet make their way to the site of his missionary labors in Baden. It was already no very uncommon thing for pious bishops of Gaul to draw to their churches some Irish recluse, like that Arnanus who was the "very faithful friend" of the famous Saint Desiderius (Didier), of Cahors (590-655), one of those great Gallo-Roman bishops who stood for religion and civil order in the truly dark centuries that followed the collapse of the Roman power in the West. To one of the personal disciples of Columbanus, the saintly Gallus (Callech or Kellach in Old-Irish), is owing the great monastery from which went forth religion and culture through all the valleys and along all the uplands of Switzerland, along the waters of the upper Danube and into the forests and mountains of Bavaria. In the lifetime of Columbanus another Irishman, Disibod, with a band of disciples, settled on the lovely heights of the actual Disibodenberg, where the Nahe and the Glan encompass with their waves this famous centre of German mediæval religious life. Yet in the same seventh century the remote deeply wooded uplands of Thuringia were the scene of the labors of Saint Kilian, over whose remains rises the noble Cathedral of Würzburg. Three famous brothers, Ultan, Foillan and Fursey, left Ireland about this period, and by way of England reached the Continent, where their names are still honored as saintly patrons of Belgium and France. The former land holds in special reverence an Irish saint of the seventh century, Livinus, and Saint Fursey is well known as the creator of a peculiar vision-literature that one day culminated in the *Divina Commedia*. Other Irishmen of this period stopped half-way in England like Dicuil, the builder of Bosham, and the forerunner of Saint Wilfred in the conversion of the South Saxons. The little island deserves also the credit of those English disciples who were brought up in its schools like Saint Willibrord, the apostle of the Frisians, and one of the most interesting of the ecclesiastical figures of the seventh century. Even Southern Italy welcomed Irish missionaries; the See of Tarentum boasts of Saint Cataldus, otherwise known in the seventh century as the chief light of the Old-Irish school of Lismore on the Blackwater.

The labors of Saint Columbanus are, therefore, but one phase of a great religious movement that is only now beginning to meet with a proper scientific appreciation—a renaissance of religion and letters

in lands once illustrious in both, and a conquest of the gross and rude heathenism that was then all too close to the outer margins of Western Christendom, and was eating its insidious way, via laxity and naturalism, into Gaul and Italy and Spain. No doubt a delicate refinement of asceticism, the desire to abandon a passionately loved fatherland, drove many such missionaries away from the beloved island. The lyric farewell of Saint Columbcille is a touching evidence of this, also a first example in literature of that romantic attachment to one's native land that antiquity never knew, and that owes its origin in Europe very largely to the plaints and threnodies of the wandering Scotie monks to whom the icy horror of the Alps and the coarse manners of the Alamannic and Thuringian barbarians recalled only too sharply the "fair hills of holy Ireland" and the gentle habits of their calm cloisters. The rather difficult chronology of our saint's life has been unravelled by Bishop Greith in his excellent account of the Old-Irish Church (1867). According to his calculations Columbanus was born in the western part of Leinster about the year 535, when the reign of Justinian was climbing to its zenith, when Saint Agapetus was sitting in the Chair of Peter and the noble Ostrogoths were beginning their heroic stand for the Italian kingdom of Theodoric. In pious anticipation of his gentle and mystic character he was called Columba, or The Dove, by his parents, who are said to have been of royal descent. But he has always been known by the more Gallic form of Columbanus, perhaps to distinguish him from his famous contemporary, Saint Columba of the Churches (Columbcille), the founder of Iona. He was certainly addressed by his own monks as Columbanus, for his life, written by the monk Jonas of Bobbio, shortly after the holy founder's death, has the following paragraph otherwise notable as one of the earliest mediæval references to Christian Ireland:

"Saint Columbanus, who is also called Columba, was born on the Island of Ireland. This is situated in the extreme ocean, and according to common report is charming, productive of various nations and undisturbed by contests with other people. Here lives the race of the 'Scoti,' who, although they lack the laws of the other nations, flourish in the doctrine of Christian strength and exceed in faith all the neighboring tribes. Columbanus was born amid the beginnings of that race's faith, in order that the religion, which in part that race cherished uncompromisingly, might be increased by his own fruitful toil and the protecting care of his associates."

It is said that his later youth was passed under the care of the holy Sinell, in the latter's school of Cleenish (Cluan-Inis), located on a low sloping island in Lough Earne, not far from Enniskillen. Some ruins of this foundation are still visible that may go back to the time of the saintly founder, himself a disciple of Saint Finnian of Clonard, one of the twelve great saints of the immediate succession of Saint Patrick. We are, therefore, yet within the classical period of the Irish Church, in touch with the swift absorbing enthusiasm that

caught the hearts of those "sons of the Scots and daughters of the Kings" whose conversion Saint Patrick loves to boast of in the remarkable booklet of his "Confession."

The biographer of Columbanus tells us that in his earliest youth his mother watched over him with so great care that she would scarcely entrust him to the nearest relatives. Before his birth she had seen him issue from her bosom like a resplendent sun—her more learned neighbors explained that she was bearing a man of remarkable genius. So the life of the boy, says Jonas, "aspired to the cultivation of good works under the leadership of Christ, without whom no good work is done." The same venerable authority gives us a glimpse of what the young Columbanus could learn at his mother's knee, or with old Sinell in the shadow of his apple tree or on the steps of his Keltic cross:

"When the childhood of Columbanus was over and he became older, he began to devote himself enthusiastically to the pursuit of grammar and the sciences, and studied with fruitful zeal all through his boyhood and youth until he became a man. But as his fine figure, his splendid color and his noble manliness made him beloved by all, the old enemy began finally to turn his deadly weapons upon him in order to catch in his nets this youth, whom he saw growing so rapidly in grace. And he aroused against him the lust of lascivious maidens, especially of those whose fine figure and superficial beauty are wont to enkindle mad desires in the hearts of men."

After praising the prudence of the youth against the wiles of these Nora Creinas and Lesbias of long ago, and curiously citing the pagan Livy to the effect that no one is rendered so sacred by religion that lust is unable to prevail against him, Jonas relates the following extremely interesting incident of the life of Columbanus, an incident that effected the saint's whole career and thereby all the mediæval interests of religion and literature:

"He feared lest ensnared by the lusts of the world he should have spent in vain so much labor on grammar, rhetoric, geometry and the Holy Scriptures. And in these perils he was strengthened by a particular aid. For as he was still meditating upon his purpose, he came to the dwelling of a holy and devout woman. He at first addressed her humbly; afterwards he began to exhort her as far as lay in his power. As she saw the increasing strength of the youth she said: 'I have gone forth to the strife as far as it lay in my power. Lo! twelve years have passed by since I have been far from my home and have sought out this place of pilgrimage. With the aid of Christ, never since then have I engaged in secular matters; after putting my hand to the plough I have not turned backward. And if the weakness of my sex had not prevented me, I would have crossed the sea and chosen a better place among strangers as my home. But you, glowing with the fire of youth, stay quietly on your native soil; out of weakness you lend your ear even against your own will to the voice of the flesh and think you can associate with the female sex without sin. But do you recall the wiles of Eve, Adam's fall, how Samson was deceived by Delilah, how David was led to injustice by the beauty of Bathsheba, how the wise Solomon was ensnared by the love of a woman? Away, O youth! away! Flee from corruption into which, as you know, many have fallen. Forsake the paths which lead to the gates of hell.'"

From this speaking picture of the ancient Irish asceticism, the numerous solitaries, male and female, in waste and lonesome places, the struggle in their new Christian hearts between the delights, innocent enough perhaps, of the common social life, and the strong im-

pulses of the spirit, we return with Columbanus to his mother's side. The words of the holy recluse had shattered his already disturbed conscience. He would, indeed, quit the world—his companions of both sexes, the games and races of his clan, the company of his deep-mouthed hounds and his gaunt gigantic wolf-dogs, the mimic battles of wrestling and hockey, the chase of the flying red deer, the wild, free life of the ocean. Often enough, tossed about on its bosom in his little coracle, he had wondered at the beauty and glory and power of the great Christian God, who had but lately driven from Ireland cruel Crom Cruach, gusty Manannan MacLir and all the Keltic Pantheon that his grandfathers in Leinster had so often invoked in the terrible stress of battle, when Ulster came on to compel the famous "Tribute" that made life bitter to every Leinsterman. Now he should nevermore look upon the sweet things of life with attachment. He would cleave henceforth to "his Druid" Christ.

"His mother in anguish begged him not to leave her. But he said: 'Hast thou not heard "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me?"' He begged his mother, who placed herself in his way and held the door, to let him go. Weeping and stretched upon the floor she said she would not permit it. Then he stepped across the threshold and asked his mother not to give way to her grief; she would never see him again in this life, but wherever the way of salvation led him, there would he go."

Thus Columbanus, as did later Saint Jane Frances de Chantal, trampled under foot every natural feeling and made the first great renunciation. Clearly he belonged to a family of repute, and his future life might well have been one of distinction and happiness among men. It is here that his relations with Sinell, or Senilis, begin, through whom the study of the Scriptures became henceforth the chief occupation of Columbanus. His aged instructor, recognizing the ability and ardor of the youth, taught him the mysteries of the Old and the New Dispensation, tried him before the other pupils with all manner of difficult questions, made endless objections, all of which, obediently and without vain glory, Columbanus solved.

"Thus Columbanus," says Jonas, "collected such treasures of holy wisdom in his breast that even as a youth he could expound the Psalter in fitting language and could make many other extracts worthy to be sung and instructive to read."

This may mean, as Cardinal Moran believes, that our saint wrote at this early date in his life an exposition of the psalms, together with many hymns, both Latin and Irish; and tractates of doctrine or edification.

There is a charming poem in Irish on the vanity of human things that Dr. John O'Donovan has translated into English. He thought it a remnant of the sixth century, the production of a primitive bard turned Christian. It was sung at the court of King Diarmid about the year 554, during the last great Feis or triennial assembly of the Kings, nobles, chieftains and musicians of Ireland. Many of the

similes and metaphors I have recognized in the Latin writings of Columbanus, notably in his metrical homily "On the Vanity of Life." It may well be one of the hymns written by him in the school of Cleenish, for the delectation of his master and brethren. In any case, it is from the hand of a contemporary and may, not without reason, be set before my readers as a specimen of the poetical training given in the Old-Irish schools. The charm of the delicate and intricate original metre must, of course, be enjoyed only in imagination, as well as the intertwined rhymes that call musically to one another all over this highly academic poetry of ancient Ireland:

Like a damask rose you see,
Or like a blossom on a tree,
Or like a dainty flower in May,
Or like the morning to the day,
Or like the sun, or like the shade,
Or like the gourd which Jonah made;
Even such is man whose thread is spun,
Drawn out and out and so is done.
The rose withers, the blossom blasteth,
The flower fades, the morning hasteth,
The sun sets, the shadow flies,
The gourd consumes, the man—he dies.

Like the grass that's newly sprung,
Or like the tale that's new begun,
Or like the bird that's here to-day,
Or like the pearled dew in May,
Or like the hour, or like the span,
Or like the singing of the swan;
Even such is man who lives by breath,
Is here, now there, in life and death.
The grass withers, the tale is ended,
The bird is flown, the dew's ascended,
The hour is short, the span not long,
The swan's near death, man's life is done.

Like to the bubble in the brook,
Or in a glass much like a look,
Or like the shuttle in weaver's hand,
Or like the writing on the sand,
Or like a thought, or like a dream,
Or like the gliding of the stream;
Even such is man, who lives in breath,
Is here, now there, in life and death.
The bubble's out, the look forgot,
The shuttle's flung, the writing's blot,
The thought is past, the dream is gone,
The waters glide, man's life is done.

Like an arrow from a bow,
Or like a swift course of water flow,
Or like the time 'twixt flood and ebb,
Or like the spider's tender web,
Or like a race or like a goal,
Or like the dealing of a dole;
Even such is man whose brittle state
Is always subject unto fate.
The arrow shot, the flood soon spent,
The time no time, the web soon rent,
The race soon run, the goal soon won,
The dole soon dead, man's life soon done.

Like to the lightning from the sky,
Or like a post that quick doth hie,
Or like a quaver in a song,
Or like a journey three days long,
Or like the snow when summer's come,

Or like the pear or like the plum;
 Even such is man, who heaps up sorrow,
 Lives but this day, and dies to-morrow.
 The lightning's past, the post must go,
 The song is short, the journey so,
 The pear doth rot, the plum doth fall,
 The snow dissolves, and so must all.

At Cleenish, we may believe, he was well instructed in Latin, which he writes with great skill. He is, indeed, by far the best Latin writer of the latter half of the sixth century. We may believe, too, that he knew Greek and Hebrew—the former language, it is now well known, could then be learned by Western men only in Ireland, where, up to the invasions of the Danes, it continued to be cultivated, as the philologist Ludwig Traube has proven beyond a doubt in his elegant little work “*O Roma Nobilis!*”

III.

But now the time had come for a final choice of callings. Jonas says no more of his internal trials—the mediæval writers seldom pay attention to a minute personal psychology of doubts and fears; not that they ignore it, but that it was a part of Christian modesty and self-restraint to spare the world the sight of a soul's travail. Nothing could be more foreign to the mediæval temper than the Byronic bawling of one's sorrows into the ear of an already over-worried humanity.

“Then he endeavored to enter a society of monks, and went to the monastery of Bangor. The abbot, the holy Comgall, renowned for his virtues, was a father to his monks and was held in high esteem for the fervor of his faith and the order and discipline which he preserved. Here Columbanus gave himself entirely to fasting and prayer, to bearing the easy yoke of Christ, to mortifying the flesh, to taking the cross upon himself and following Christ, in order that he who was to be made a teacher of others might show the learning which he taught more fruitfully by his own example in mortifying his own body, and that he who was to instruct might first instruct himself.”

Bangor had been founded by Saint Comgall in 552 or 558, and it seems to have been a few years later (560), at the age of 25, that Columbanus entered the famous monastery. Comgall was one of the “twelve apostles” of Ireland, and one of the seven great insular writers of monastic rules, the others being Patrick, Bridget, Kieran, Columba, Molaise and Adamnan. His rule was written in Old-Irish verse, and later was the model for that which Columbanus gave to Luxeuil and Bobbio. Very soon he gathered about him three thousand monks, who dwelt in huts of wattles or osier or in small cells shaped like bee-hives and made of rude uncemented stones, some specimens of which cells may yet be seen on the Skellig Rocks. The fare was poor and rare; for a long time milk was unknown, and even fish, plentiful enough in the neighboring bay of Carrickfergus, was provided only for guests. The Martyrology of

Donegal (1156-1173) says that the "old books of Erin" relate how Comgall was the educator of many saints and kindled in their hearts the love of God. He, too, had studied with Finnian of Clonard, and had been ordained priest at Clonmacnoise. His school companions had been the holy Columbcille and the holy Cainnech.

One of the most venerable monuments of Old-Irish verse is precisely a lament of the holy man of Iona over his enforced exile, with its separation from these friends of his youth. The personal note is here, the subjective standard of the universe and life, the poignant cry of the stricken heart, a genuine root of romanticism, that shall later blossom into an entrancing but peculiar and unique literature :

O Son of my God, what a pride, what a pleasure
To plough the blue sea!
The waves of the fountain of deluge to measure,
Dear Erin, to thee.

We are rounding Moy-n-Olurg, we sweep by its head, and
We plunge through Lough Foyle,
Whose swans could enchant with their music the dead, and
Make pleasure of toil.

Alas for the voyage, O high King of Heaven,
Enjoined upon me,
For that I on the red plain of bloody Cooledrevin
Was present to see.

Three things I am leaving behind me, the very
Most dear that I know,
Tir-Leedach I'm leaving, and Durrow and Derry,
Alas, I must go!

Yet my visit and feasting with Comgall have eased me
At Cainnech's right hand,
And all but thy government, Eiré, had pleased me,
Thou waterfall land!

When Columbanus had spent many years at Bangor, it is said as the head master of the school, a longing came upon him to go out like Abraham from his country and kindred into a strange land. In the words of his biographer, "he began to desire a pilgrimage." Doubtless the words of the old recluse were yet ringing in his ears. His desire was the cause of great sorrow to Comgall, who was now growing deaf and infirm. Yet in the end he overcame his personal interests, remembering, perhaps, that in his own youth he, too, had wished to cross the Irish Sea and labor for the salvation of the heathen Angles and Saxons. So we are told by Jonas that the good old abbat called to himself Columbanus "and bestowed upon him the bond of peace, the strength of solace, and companions who were known for their piety." Columbanus was then (589-590) probably some 55 years old. With the prayers of all, and surrounded by his twelve companions, "under the guidance of Christ," he went down to the neighboring seashore.

"Here they waited to see if the mercy of the Almighty would allow their pur-
VOL. XXVI—3

pose to succeed, and learned that the Spirit of the all-merciful Judge was with them. So they embarked and began the dangerous journey across the channel and sailed quickly with a smooth sea and a favorable wind to the coast of Brittanica (Scotland). Here they rested for a while to recover their strength and discussed their plans anxiously until finally they decided to enter the land of Gaul. They wanted zealously and shrewdly to inquire into the disposition of the inhabitants, in order to remain longer if they found they could sow the seeds of salvation; or in case they found the hearts of the people in darkness, go on to the nearest nations."

Columbanus was destined never more to see Bangor. His warm heart must have ached as the sea-going galley bore away towards the Scottish coast. Perhaps more than once, like his namesake, he "turned a gray eye" towards the "waterfall land" of Eiré. Perhaps, too, he bore with him in his "scatula" or sack some of those documents that were soon to be copied into the famous Antiphonary of Bangor that was certainly in the library of his beloved Bobbio before the year 691. In it is the sweet quaint Latin hymn, "O Benchuir bona regula!" that is all made up of tender reminiscences of the primitive monastic paradise which overlooked the waters that now lap the strand of the little Bay of Bangor on the northernmost coast of Down.

Eastward, across the rough and stormy waters of the North Channel, lay the hospitable "White House" (Candida Casa) of the monks of Wales, at Whithern, a site dear to the Irish brethren; for thence had come since a hundred years and more no little of religion, literature, piety and sweet social intercourse. Saint Gildas, nebulous as his person appears, an early benefactor of the Church in Ireland, had been abbat of Whithern. In these waters also lay the Isle of Man, once a mysterious resort and nursery of Druidism, now the seat of a Christian bishopric established by Saint Patrick. Northward from Bangor lay those innumerable rocky islets that stretched away to the Orkneys and the Shetlands, already inhabited by a host of Irish solitaries who disputed with the dripping rocks and the clinging seals and the wave-tossed "duilisc," or dulse, the right to praise the love and goodness of a provident Creator. Where, in all Aryan literature, is there any such piercing challenging personal note of mingled faith and nature-kinship like the very old sea-song that from time immemorial has borne the thumb-mark of Saint Columbcille (Columbcille fecit)? It is as though a poet-saint had been placed in charge of some great lonely light amid the terrible joys and more terrible sorrows of the wooings of Earth and Sea, as they come before the eye of mythopœic fancy.

Delightful would it be to me in Uchd Ailiun
On the pinnacle of a rock,
That I might often see
The face of the ocean;
That I might see its heaving waves
Over the wide ocean,
When they chant music to their Father
Upon the world's course;

That I might see its level sparkling strand,
It would be no cause of sorrow;
That I might hear the song of the wonderful birds,
Source of happiness;
That I might hear the thunder of the crowding waves
Upon the rocks;
That I might hear the roar by the side of the church
Of the surrounding sea;
That I might see its noble flocks
O'er the watery ocean;
That I might see the sea monsters,
The greatest of all wonders;
That I might see its ebb and flood
In their career;
That my mystical name might be, I say,
Cul Ri Erin;
That contrition might come upon my heart
Upon looking at her;
That I might bewail my evil all,
Though it were difficult to compute them;
That I might bless the Lord
Who conserves all
Heaven with its countless bright orders,
Land, strand and flood;
That I might search the books all
That would be good for my soul;
At times kneeling to beloved Heaven;
At times psalm-singing;
At times contemplating the King of Heaven,
Holy the chief;
At times at work without compulsion,
This would be delightful.
At times plucking dillisc from the rocks;
At times at fishing;
At times giving to the poor;
At times in a carcair;
The best advice in the presence of God
To me has been vouchsafed.
The King whose servant I am will not let
Anything deceive me.

Such music must have been in the heart of Columbanus and his twelve monks as they put out into the deep. Other things than the swelling uplands of Bangor, its green fields and silver strand, were henceforth shrouded from the sight of these apostolic men. The future devastations of the cruel Picts and the still more cruel Northmen were happily hidden from their view; so, too, was the restoration of the holy house by Saint Malachy that has found no less a chronicler than Saint Bernard. I do not doubt that the opening strophes of the hymn on the rule of Bangor are the lamentations of Columbanus over his departure from that holy place; perhaps they are his very words piously treasured at Bobbio, where the letter and the spirit of Bangor were long observed.

"Holy is the rule of Bangor; it is noble, just and admirable. Blessed is its community, founded on unerring faith, graced with the hope of salvation, perfect in charity—a ship that is never submerged, though beaten by the waves. A house full of delights, founded upon a rock. Truly an enduring city, strong and fortified. The Ark shaded by the Cherubim, on all sides overlaid with gold. A princess meet for Christ, clad in the sun's light. A truly regal hall adorned with various gems."

When Jonas says that they went first to Brittania, he means the northern part of Britain or the modern Scotland, where Christianity was flourishing at the end of the sixth century. The little band seems

to have moved about those Dalriadan communities for a while and to have preached the Gospel, after the principles above stated. As they moved along the coast of Western Scotland, through the Christian monasteries of Wales and Cornwall, they were following the beaten path of Irish missionaries. Their white garments would draw attention, likewise their curious tonsure that left the head bare in front of a line drawn from ear to ear, while the rest of their long locks hung freely. Each priest bore, hanging from the neck, a "scatula" or bag, in which were to be found his relics, his ritual books, psalter, sacramentary or Mass-book and the like, his "Chrysmale" or apparatus for baptism, his chalice, the Holy Scriptures, other objects of a liturgical character and his mazer or hard-wood drinking cup.

Their altar was easily set up, in an open field, by the seashore, beneath a spreading oak. Their speech was direct and burning, often rude and unsparing. They were a new apostolate and laid everywhere the knife to the root. Many a semi-Christian breathed more freely when they shook the dust of his dwelling from their feet and set forth again, with high uplifted cross and ringing their odd little bells, each man with his trusty staff cut from an Irish hedge, each voice thundering the psalms of David or the dear old canticles of Erin, written anew or transformed for Patrick by those high singers like Dubtach, whose conversion had turned the long-wavering balance in favor of Christianity.

Perhaps even then Columbanus had the desire of converting the Angles and Saxons yet heathen—the Roman mission (596) was, however, already taking shape in the heart and brain of Saint Gregory the Great (590-604). Not improbably the contact with the Christians of Wales and Cornwall had already in some way affected, no doubt through the Markland of holy Gloucester, the general temperament of the conquering Low Dutch tribes. Perhaps, too, having broken the resistance of the Keltic Britons, they were weary of slaughter and destruction and, like the Vandals and Goths, sought to possess and enjoy in peace. No little intermarriage took place along the smoking border between the Dutch warriors and the captive women of the Britons. Welsh and Cornish slaves and outlaws were long an entering wedge for Christianity. A Christian woman was Queen in Kent. Who knows what might have happened had Ethelberga dared what a few years later the Lombard Theodolinda did—the calling of Irish missionaries as the first step in a national conversion?

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catholic University, Washington.

IL DIALOGO DI GALILEO GALILEI LINCEO.

II.

THE first portion of our article (which appeared in the April number of this magazine) brought down our narrative to the point when Galileo was commanded to present himself in Rome in order to explain his conduct, and the printing of his work was suspended by an order from the Master of the Sacred Palace. We did not attempt, lest we should exceed the limits of our space, to give a full précis of the Dialogue; but we might have observed that even in the first part of it, though less interesting and less immediately bearing on the great question at issue than those which follow, there are yet some remarkable passages indicating the author's knowledge of mechanics, as, for instance, the velocity acquired by a ball rolling down a perfectly smooth inclined plane. There are also some curious specimens of the ideas current among unscientific though well-educated men at that day. Salviati, for example, finds it almost impossible to convince Simplicio that the surface of the Moon is rough and irregular, like that of the Earth, and not, as he persists in thinking, perfectly smooth, like a polished mirror.

To resume, however, the narrative where we left it, a special commission which had been appointed to examine the book reported that Galileo had been disobedient to orders by affirming as an absolute truth the movement of the earth instead of stating it as a hypothesis; and by deceitfully keeping silence as to the order given him in 1616 to abandon the opinion that the earth revolved, and that the sun was the centre of the universe.

Another memorial drawn up about the same time accused him (besides those things just mentioned) of having without leave placed at the beginning of his work the permission for printing delivered at Rome; of having put the true doctrine in the mouth of a fool and having approved it but feebly by the argument of another interlocutor (Sagredo); of having treated the subject as one that was not already decided, in allusion doubtless to the decree of the Index in 1616, and of having affirmed (untruly) the equality supposed to exist, for understanding geometrical matters, between the divine and human intellect—an accusation pointing to some apprehensions then existing that false philosophical and theological doctrines might be drawn out of Galileo's opinions. The result of all this was that the old philosopher was summoned to Rome to answer

for his offenses, and notwithstanding his plea of infirm health and advanced age he was obliged to obey the summons. On arriving at Rome he was received at the palace of the Tuscan ambassador, Niccolini. After a short interval he was conveyed to the office of the Inquisition and lodged there by the Pope's order well and commodiously. On the 12th of April, 1633, he appeared for the first time before the Inquisition; he admitted the authorship of the Dialogue, and also that the decree of the Index had been notified to him; but he stated that Cardinal Bellarmine had informed him that it was allowed to hold the Copernican doctrine as a hypothesis, and he did not think he had contravened the order given him that he should not defend this doctrine; this prohibition, however, we may observe was probably intended to include *indirect* support of the theory in question, as through the medium of a personage in a dialogue, though he did not so understand it. This may well have been the case, but it seems strange indeed that he should have said, as he appears to have done, that he had not embraced or defended the opinion that the earth is in motion and the sun stationary, but had, on the contrary, shown that the reasons produced by Copernicus were feeble and inconclusive. It must be also remembered that at a subsequent hearing he stated, after having referred to his Dialogue, that there were some arguments (one being that of the tides) which he had put too forcibly. He is also recorded to have said that he had not held as true the condemned opinion, and was ready to write something fresh in order to refute it.

It does indeed seem that he had not the courage of his convictions, and it is very possible that he did not make a favorable impression on his judges, who might well have considered him wanting in candor and sincerity. In fact, the Pope gave orders that he should be questioned as to his *intention*; then after being threatened with torture (apparently without the view of putting the threat into execution) he should be made to pronounce an abjuration, and should be condemned to prison according to the discretion of the Inquisition, that his treatise should be prohibited and that he should be forbidden henceforth to treat of the subject by word or by writing. It has also been stated (though we do not feel quite sure of the fact) that the last mentioned injunction was laid on him *sub pœna relapsus*; that is to say, that in case of his disobedience he would be treated as a relapsed heretic would be; and an attempt has been made for controversial purposes to show that this threat was tantamount to a definition that the Copernican theory was a heresy.

It is true that when the Church solemnly condemns a heretic, the opinion held by the condemned individual is thereby declared to be heretical. But to maintain that an injunction issued by the Pope

as Head of the Congregation of the Inquisition, and communicated *personally* to Galileo, however severe in a disciplinary point of view, is to be considered as an *ex cathedra* decision, is not only contrary to the best theological opinion, but we may venture to add contrary also to common sense. A threat of the practical treatment to be expected from the Inquisition under certain contingencies is surely not to be compared with a solemn doctrinal decision by the Pope speaking *ex cathedra* and manifesting his intention (as he does in such cases) of binding the consciences of all Catholics. The Pope was in this instance administering discipline rigorously if you please, but not defining any dogma; and to attempt to confound the two things, in themselves essentially different, is one of those controversial stratagems of which we may recognize the smartness, while we deny its relevancy to the true questions at issue. To return, however, to our narrative: he was accordingly asked (on the 21st of June) how long he had held the opinion that the sun and not the earth was the centre of the universe, and he replied that before the decree of 1616 he held that the two opinions could be equally maintained, but that since the decree, being convinced of the prudence of the superior authorities, he had adopted and still held the opinion of Ptolemy on the mobility of the sun as true and indubitable. Certain passages in his book were then put to him as being irreconcilable with such statements, and he was threatened with torture if he did not tell the truth. Yet he persevered in his answer, as already stated; and the tribunal, after making him sign his deposition, dismissed him. On the next day (22d of June) he was taken to Sta. Maria sopra Minerva, and brought before the Cardinals and Prelates of the Congregation that he might hear his sentence and pronounce his abjuration.

He had been accused of having openly violated the order given him not to maintain Copernicanism and of having unfairly extorted permission to print his book without showing the prohibition received in 1616, also of having maintained the condemned opinion, although he alleged that he had left it undecided and simply probable, which, however, was still a grave error, since an opinion declared contrary to Scripture could not be in any way probable.

Now it is not generally known, but we believe it to be certainly the fact, that neither the Cardinals who composed the tribunal of the Inquisition, nor the Consultors, were unanimous in the condemnation of Galileo—a minority being in his favor—but the Pope, following presumably the general usage, sanctioned the decision of the majority, though he was by no means obliged to do so. Technically speaking, this circumstance makes no difference, but it may be considered as weakening the moral weight of the judgment. The

sentence was to the effect that Galileo had rendered himself strongly suspected of heresy in maintaining and believing a doctrine false and opposed to Holy Scripture and in believing that one might maintain any opinion that had been declared contrary to Holy Scripture. He had therefore incurred the censures in force against those who offended in such ways, from which, however, he would be absolved provided that with a sincere heart and unfeigned faith he would abjure the said errors and heresies, but he was as a penance and warning to others to undergo certain inflictions, the book was to be prohibited, he himself was to be condemned to the ordinary prison of the Holy Office for a time and was to recite the seven penitential psalms once a week for three years. The Holy Office reserved to itself power to remit or change part or all of these penances. It is well known that Galileo abjured accordingly. There is a legend, also well known, that after doing so he stamped with his foot on the ground, and said: "*E pur si muove*" (and yet it, *i. e.*, the earth, does move), but there is no authority for this most unlikely story, and it may be dismissed as fabulous. The Pope at once commuted the sentence of imprisonment to one of seclusion in the Palace of the Tuscan Ambassador in the Monte Pincio. Indeed all throughout there had been a disposition to treat him in such a way as to avoid personal or bodily severity, the above mentioned threat of torture not being intended presumably to be ever carried out. He was afterwards allowed to retire to Siena, the Archbishop of which place (Piccolomini by name), one of his warmest friends, received him into his palace and treated him with all possible kindness and attention; indeed, if the reports that reached Rome were true, the Archbishop seems to have gone beyond the limits of prudence, considering the peculiar circumstances of the case, for he is said to have hinted to various persons that in his opinion Galileo had been unjustly condemned; that he was the greatest man in the world and would always live in his writings. If so, he did more harm than good to his friend, for the report of these observations, coupled with an accusation from some hostile source that Galileo had, under the encouragement of his host the Archbishop, spread opinions in Siena that were not soundly Catholic, caused some additional strictness to be enforced as to the manner of his subsequent seclusion.

Whatever may have been the injudicious remarks of the kind and friendly prelate, we are not disposed to believe in the truth of the accusation against Galileo himself; prudence and discretion were not leading features in his character, but we do not credit the report that he spread dangerous opinions in Siena; it would have been the height of folly on his part to do so, instead of occupying his leisure in gazing on the beauties of the magnificent Cathedral, the glory of

that city, built within and without of black and white marble, and marking the transition from the old Italian to the Gothic style of architecture, with its row of circular arches, surmounted by the fine Gothic windows above. He did not, however, remain very long at Siena, but went back to his house at Arcetri, near Florence, where he lived for four years in a somewhat strict seclusion. At a later period, in 1638, owing to his increasing infirmities—for he had become at least partially blind—permission was given him to reside in Florence on condition that he should not speak to his visitors on the subject of the movement of the earth. He consequently resided in Florence during the few remaining years of his life, and he died on the 8th of January, 1642, in his 78th year. He had occupied his time since his condemnation in mathematical and mechanical studies, and in fact had published another dialogue on these very subjects, introducing the same three disputants as before. Simplicio bears a somewhat similar part to that in the former dialogue. He is no simpleton, but he is uninstructed in these questions, yet willing to learn.¹

We are not, as we have already intimated, writing a full biographical notice of Galileo, nor are we giving a full list of his discoveries, but we may justly say of him that in a scientific point of view he was, with the possible exception of Kepler, the first man of his day. It is related of him that by watching the motion of a lamp suspended in the Cathedral at Pisa he acquired the knowledge of the law which regulates the vibrations of a pendulum, a law familiar at the present time to all persons who are acquainted with the principles of mechanics, but not then known. We have already stated that he was amongst the first, indeed probably the very first, who applied the telescope to astronomical purposes, and thereby did more than any one before him to demolish the old system of Ptolemy and others.

He it was, moreover, who first understood the law that regulates the velocity of falling bodies; he perceived that they were acted upon by an uniformly accelerating force, that of terrestrial gravity, the existence of which he recognized, though not, of course, understanding the far-reaching character of that mysterious force.

We have said, too, that his mind was never in a state of stagnation; as long as he lived he was progressing in the acquirement of scientific truth, and thus before the close of his life he emancipated himself from the erroneous notion that circular motion alone is naturally uniform, and we can scarcely suppose that Kepler's discoveries should have been without some influence on his active mind. Again, in the Dialogue on Mechanics to which we have

¹ There is a copy of this curious work in the library of the Royal Astronomical Society in London, contained in a handsome Italian edition of Galileo's works; there is also an English translation of it, published early in the eighteenth century.

alluded (published as late as 1638) he introduced words which implied a discovery of what is known as the first law of motion, the first of the three laws which now bear Newton's name and which is to the effect that every body perseveres in its state of rest or of uniform motion in a straight line unless it be compelled to change that state by forces impressed on it. This law involved nothing less than a revolution in the conception of the laws of motion as previously understood. Many people, though otherwise educated, probably even now do not understand it, and in Galileo's days it was wholly unknown.

We think it right to call attention to the great attainments of this eminent man of science, for we think we have noticed in the remarks of some Catholic writers a tendency to undervalue them and to represent him as one who made certainly a good guess, which subsequently turned out to be correct, but which at the time was based on false or insufficient proofs. How far this is from being the fact we have already seen. Writers of this class have never studied the Dialogue, as we have already remarked, nor have they learnt to appreciate the important contribution that Galileo made to the science of his day.

The condemnation of the Copernican theory involved in the sentence of the Inquisition was, we believe, enforced stringently, nor was it relaxed for more than 120 years. But in the year 1757, under the Pontificate of Benedict XIV., a new Index was published, in which the prohibition of books teaching the Copernican theory was omitted. Such a step would not have been taken without the sanction of the Inquisition; it was nevertheless considered expedient after the lapse of more than sixty years to give a more explicit decision on the subject, and in the year 1820 a distinct permission was given by the Holy Office for teaching the movement of the earth, and again in 1822 (a re-examination of the whole subject having taken place) a decree was issued, sanctioned by the reigning Pope, Leo XII., declaring that the printing and publishing at Rome of works treating of the movement of the earth and the immobility of the sun was henceforth permitted.

Much hostile criticism, as we all know, has been leveled against the Roman Congregations of the Inquisition and the Index for their prohibition of Copernican writings and books and for the condemnation of Galileo, and we do not consider it to be any part of our duty, writing though we are from a strictly Catholic standpoint, to defend them. Yet there are circumstances that require to be borne in mind as at least affording some explanation of the inflexible severity with which the advocates of the new astronomical theory were treated.

We who have been taught from our childhood that the earth revolves daily on its axis and annually round the sun may well be surprised at the opposition which these elementary truths (as we now consider them) encountered in an age not so very remote from our own as the early part of the seventeenth century. But the teaching of this astronomical theory struck a formidable blow at various notions and ideas prevalent in the middle ages, and natural enough before the telescope was invented. It must have been a terrible revulsion of feeling for men who had always looked on the earth as the physical centre of the Universe to be taught that it was a planet moving like others round the sun. Then we must also remember that good and sound as were some of the arguments used by Galileo in the *Dialogue*, they were not absolutely conclusive, and indeed were not considered by himself to be so; for had they been so, he could not, without being guilty of gross falsehood, have answered his judges in the way he did. Even as it was, he seems to have made an unfavorable impression on them by his apparent want of candor; besides which a circumstance which tended to create a prejudice against him in their minds was the fact of the *Dialogue* having been written in the vernacular language. To us that may indeed appear a strange objection to make to any scientific work, but Latin was at that time the language in general use among men of learning and was adopted by Newton many years later when he published his "*Principia*." The feeling amongst the Roman ecclesiastics probably was that an essay addressed to experts in a language known only to the learned was a different thing from one addressed to the general public in a language known to all.

Speculations on what might have been the result if people had acted differently are perhaps not much to the purpose, but we have sometimes thought that if Galileo had been more plainly straightforward, had acknowledged that he inclined to Copernicanism as a scientific hypothesis, but stated that he would not teach it if the ecclesiastical authorities forbade him to do so, he might have made a far better impression on his judges, and perhaps have converted the minority already disposed to favor him into a majority.

We may here observe that having so frequently used the word *Copernican* to designate the modern system of astronomy as opposed to that of Ptolemy and others, we employ the expression for the sake of convenience, and not as intending to imply that the theory as stated by Copernicus is now held by any astronomer; for his idea was that the earth and the planets moved in *circles* round the sun, which we now know to be a mistake, as was afterwards shown by Kepler and Newton. The orbits of the planets are elliptical, the sun being in one of the foci.

Having given a brief but (as we hope) a sufficient resumé of the facts bearing on Galileo's case, we now proceed to discuss the ecclesiastical force and bearing of the decrees of the Inquisition and the Index, both as regards contemporary Catholics and as regards ourselves, or in other words, the Church considered generally and apart from the particular case of the Catholics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The latter question, though immeasurably the more important, is easier and simpler to deal with. In answer then to the hostile critics who have alleged that the infallibility of the Church is compromised by the above mentioned sentence and decrees, we state what we believe is the doctrine generally if not universally held by the best Roman theologians. It amounts to this: No decision of a Roman Congregation as such, even though sanctioned by the Pope as Head of the Congregation, is infallible; or to employ the usual technical expression, *irreformable*. If, however, the Pope takes up any decision and promulgates it in such a way that he makes it his own, and manifests his intention of binding all Catholics to receive it, then, provided, of course, that it be a matter of faith or morals, it becomes irreformable, as indeed is evident from the decree of the Vatican Council. This certainly was not done in the case of Galileo, nor in fact was it ever done in that age in any case whatever.

The Roman Congregations, as we have ventured to remark elsewhere, seem to us to resemble the outworks of an impregnable fortress; they may be taken by the enemy (owing to the mistake of some officer) and subsequently recovered; damage more or less serious may have been caused, but the fortress remains secure as ever. We must not, however, be understood as denying that there have been, and may again be, decisions of a Congregation of such a purely doctrinal character that though technically speaking not irreformable, they may be considered as morally and theologically certain, and their reception as such be enforced by the Holy See. The case of Professor Ubags seems one of this nature. No work of his was put on the Index, but certain doctrines or opinions extracted from his works were condemned by the United Congregations of the Index and Inquisition, and the decision was ratified and confirmed by the Pope, Pius IX.

During the same Pontificate there occurred another instance, totally different as to the details of treatment, but similar in principle, in the condemnation of the works of Günther, a theologian and philosopher of some distinction. His books appear to have been put upon the Index without any extracts being selected for censure or any reason assigned (as indeed is generally the usage with books that are prohibited), upon which Günther and many of his followers

submitted, but others contended that a mere disciplinary decree was not conclusive. The Pope, however, addressed a brief to the Archbishop of Cologne, intimating that a decree sanctioned by his authority and published by his order (which had already been done) should have sufficed to close the question; that the doctrine taught by Günther could not be held to be true, and that it was not henceforth permitted to any one to defend it.

This may strike us, at the first moment, as exceptionally strong language to use in the case of a prohibitory decree in which no explicit censure was pronounced and for which no reason was assigned, but the fact is that the decree, though in form merely of a disciplinary character, was founded on important doctrinal reasons, since Günther's chief error had been already condemned by the Council of Vienne. We may observe, moreover, that the words in the Pope's brief to which we have alluded do not read as if they were a definition of a matter of faith, stringent and forcible though they were.

We have heard it remarked by a theologian holding an important official position in one of the Roman Congregations that all the Congregational decisions, even those that touch upon doctrine, are to a certain extent disciplinary in their character, and in fact have the nature of what the Italians would term a "*providimento*." At the same time (as the same able theologian stated on another occasion) there are decisions which impose internal assent *per se*, but not the assent of faith. This is implied by the duty of obedience and our knowledge of the care and prudence brought to bear on the point at issue, but even so such decision may not always be binding on some one who has *special* reasons for entertaining a misgiving as to its being a sound decision. Hence—he proceeded to state—the possible and in some cases actual reversal of Congregational decisions *propter noviter deducta*. It must still be remembered that the prohibitive action of any Roman Congregation must in any case be obeyed, and that it is not lawful for any one to teach a doctrine so condemned as long as the prohibition is in force.

It is obvious that the decisions of the Roman Congregations may be divided into three classes: those which are so immediately and directly doctrinal, as in the two cases mentioned above, that even if not properly speaking infallible, they must be considered as practically irreversible. Then on the other hand there are the purely disciplinary decisions, some of them of a temporary nature, but all requiring obedience as long as they are in force. Finally there are others which are, strictly speaking, disciplinary, but are grounded on doctrinal reasons to such an extent as to give them indirectly the character of doctrinal decisions (and to impose the obligation of in-

ternal assent, at least under the limitations above mentioned), but not so as to render them irreformable.

Considerations such as these lead us to the answer we have to give to the former of the two questions which we undertook to discuss, namely, the effect of the anti-Copernican decrees on the conscience and conduct of Catholics—we mean, of course, good and obedient Catholics—between the time of Galileo and that of the new Index (omitting the former prohibitions) under Benedict XIV. The decrees evidently belong to the last named class; they were disciplinary in respect of their immediate purport, but were based on the question of the interpretation of Scripture.

Thus we have seen that the majority who carried the decision of the Holy Office in 1633, condemning Galileo, referred to the former decree of the Index as having declared the Copernican theory to be contrary to Holy Scripture, that having been the reason explicitly stated for the prohibition of certain works written on the Copernican side.

Decrees such as these may be reconsidered and (to repeat the words we have already quoted) be reversed *propter noviter deducta*. It is notorious that the interpretation of Scripture has in some respects varied at different times. We say *in some respects*, because there are some portions of Scripture, relating to doctrine in the strict sense of the word, which we are forbidden to interpret otherwise than according to the common consent of the Fathers. But it is evident that the interpretation of passages bearing on some other subjects, such as physical science, has considerably varied at different periods.

Besides the case now under consideration, there is one which must occur to every one who reflects on the subject, the Scriptural narrative of the creation of the world. We ourselves can remember the time when it would have been considered a rash and dangerous thing—and perhaps by Protestants more than by Catholics—to interpret the six days of the Mosaic record otherwise than as meaning natural days of 24 hours, and yet scarcely any one does so now. Then, again, the opinion that the body of man, as considered separately from his soul, was derived from a lower animal, would formerly have been considered as rank infidelity; and yet it is not now supposed generally to be *contra fidem*, though perhaps temerarious.

Indeed this principle of Scriptural interpretation was held by no less a man than Cardinal Bellarmine; for in a letter addressed to the Carmelite Father Foscarini, after admitting that there was no objection to the Copernican doctrine if stated hypothetically, though there would be if stated positively and as a reality, he goes on to say that when there should be a real demonstration that the sun stands in the centre of the universe and that the earth revolves around it, it

would then be necessary to proceed with great consideration in explaining those passages of Scripture which seem to be contrary to it; and rather to say that we do not understand them than say that a thing which is demonstrated is false. He would not, however, until it had been shown to him, believe that there could be any such demonstration, and in a case of doubt one ought not to leave the interpretation of Scripture as given by the Fathers. This letter was dated 1st April, 1615, nearly a year before the decree of the Index; but Bellarmine probably foresaw at the time that some such decree would take place; and indeed he is generally supposed to have had a considerable share in bringing it about.

And he did not by any means stand alone in his opinion. The Jesuit Father Fabri, many years later (probably about fifty years), in replying to some correspondent who maintained the Copernican theory, wrote as follows: "There is no reason why the Church should not understand those texts in their literal sense and declare that they should be so understood so long as there is no demonstration to prove the contrary. But if any such demonstration hereafter be devised by your party (which I do not at all expect), in that case the Church will not at all hesitate to set forth that these texts are to be understood in an improper—*i. e.*, non-literal—and figurative sense, according to the words of the poet, '*terraque urbesque recedunt.*'" This Father Fabri appears to have held the office of Canon Penitentiary of St. Peter's.

It is also said that Father Grassi in an interview that he had with Guidacci some few years subsequently to the decree of the Index (probably about 1623) expressed himself in similar language: "When a demonstration of this movement" (that of the earth) "shall be discovered, it will be fitting to interpret Scripture otherwise than has hitherto been done; this is the opinion of Cardinal Bellarmine."

If this then was the opinion of a learned theologian like Cardinal Bellarmine, who when he expressed it was in all probability laboring to get the Copernican theory condemned by such a decree as was subsequently issued, we have a strong confirmation of the view we have stated above, *viz.*, that decisions of this nature, that is, resting on the question of the interpretation of Scripture, are reversible "*propter noviter deducta,*" *i. e.*, when a fresh light has been thrown on the subject.

We incline then to the opinion that men whose education and knowledge of astronomy fitted them to form any judgment upon the question at issue were not at any time bound to give interior assent to the decrees of the Index and the Inquisition; and even if they had been so, it would not have involved more than a suspension of judgment until fresh evidence were forthcoming. Outward

obedience was, however, required, and no one could read the forbidden works without permission or publish a work advocating the Copernican doctrine excepting as a scientific hypothesis, merely stated as such.

An illustration of the attitude expected from Catholics qualified as we have just supposed may be found in the conduct of the two Fathers of the order of Minims, Le Seur and Jacquier, who published without rebuke an edition of the *Principia* of Newton in the year 1742, when the decrees were still in force, in which they inserted a protest to the effect that they entirely conformed themselves to the decrees of the Church on the question involved. It need scarcely be remarked that the principles put forth by Newton were entirely destructive of the old Ptolemean system of astronomy, and indeed supplied the key to the true motion of the heavenly bodies in a way which had never before been done.

And this leads us to observe that the discovery of the law of universal gravitation has justly been attributed to Newton; for he was the first to grapple with it thoroughly, and to show by the aid of his great mathematical genius how strong were the probabilities of its truth. Others, however, had guessed, at least partially, that some law of the kind regulated the motions of the heavenly bodies, and Hooke (a contemporary of Newton) had certainly come very near to the perception of its truth. Indeed, a young curate in the north of England, Horrox by name, the first observer of a transit of Venus, which took place in the year 1639, whose brilliant scientific career was cut off by an early death, might if he had lived have left a name in astronomical history as the discoverer of the great problem; for the identity of the force which acts on the heavenly bodies with that which attracts the objects we see around us to the earth—the great point of Newton's discovery—appears to have occurred to his mind; but as we have already said, he did not live to work it out, and Newton has obtained the credit, and rightly so, of "the greatest scientific discovery ever made," as it has not inaptly been called.

Even so, however, there were difficulties in its reception, and it was not until after the lapse of several years that it was universally received even by men of science.

Our space does not allow of our explaining in detail the reasons which we now have for considering the Copernican theory of astronomy (using the word *Copernican* in the sense we have already stated) as a scientific truth admitting of no appreciable doubt. The theory of universal gravitation may be treated as a moral certainty, and if it be true, it follows that when two heavenly bodies have a motion of revolution imparted to them, they both revolve round their common centre of gravity; if the masses of the two bodies are

nearly equal or at least not vastly unequal, the centre of gravity will lie somewhere between them, and they will both revolve round it, as is the case with many of the stars, the double stars as they are termed; if the mass of one body is enormously greater than that of the other it may be that the common centre of gravity lies within the volume of the larger and more massive body, as is the case with the earth and the sun, and therefore the earth revolves truly round the sun; but as Newton (confirming Kepler's theory) showed, not in a circle, but in an ellipse, in a focus of which the sun is situated.

The invention of the telescope shook to its foundation the old Ptolemean system of astronomy; the establishment of the theory of universal gravitation (with some subsequent discoveries) gave it its death-blow.

It must still be remembered that the conviction we have of the truth of the Copernican system is not the same in character as that arising from rigid experimental treatment (such as one gets in some sciences); experiments of a strictly demonstrative nature are not practicable in this case. What we, however, have is a moral certainty so strong as to exclude all reasonable doubt.

We have been led to make these observations partly by the circumstance above mentioned of the permitted publication by the two Minim fathers of the *Principia* of Newton with the protest inserted as to their submission to the decrees of the Church. Any capable mathematician on reading such a work could not but see that though stated as a mere hypothesis, Newton's theory carried with it a considerable probability of its truth.

We must not omit to notice the Bull of Alexander VII., published in 1644, which authorized a new Index and for that purpose incorporated it with the Bull itself. This also has been used for a controversial purpose, it being alleged that a solemn Papal sanction was hereby given to the anti-Copernican decrees. This is a good *argumentum ad hominem* as against certain theologians who have tried to draw a distinction between decrees that are actually signed by the Pope and those that (like that of the Index of 1613) are not so signed, though it is notorious that they had the Pope's approbation as Head of the Congregation. As we do not adopt that line of argument, all that is necessary for us to say is that we consider the Bull not as a dogmatic one, but one of a purely disciplinary character, and that it gave no greater sanction to the new Index than the old one already had. We scarcely think it necessary in addressing the readers of this *Review* to argue that the Church has a right to put some restriction on the indiscriminate publication of books and on indiscriminate reading, even though the books should be of a scientific character and should advocate some theory, doubtful at

the time, but which afterwards turns out to be true. The interests which the Church is safeguarding are far more important than those of physical science, even if the latter sustain some temporary drawback; and we cannot admit that the occurrence of a mistake in administering ecclesiastical discipline (as in the case before us), however much we may regret it, can be considered as interfering with the soundness of the general principle.

Indeed we believe that Galileo himself, were he still living amongst us, would agree with the opinion we have just stated; that he might complain of the application of the ecclesiastical discipline in his own case, but would approve of the principle of it, for he lived and died (notwithstanding certain faults, and one grave fault in early life) a good and devout son of the Catholic Church.

And perhaps this circumstance may help to explain the retraction before the Inquisition. True it is that his conduct seems wanting in candor, and it probably gave that impression to his judges; but we do not know what passed in his mind, and it is possible that in a matter which was not free from doubt, however great the probability of the theory might appear to be, he thought it right to defer to the ecclesiastical authorities for the time being and waive his own scientific judgment. At all events, it is more pleasing to take this view of his abjuration than to attribute it entirely to fear or other unworthy motive.

We think it will not be inappropriate if we quote here an extract from a work of Cardinal Newman's, for he particularly refers to the case of Galileo. It is from the introduction to the "*Via Media*," the edition published many years after the Cardinal's conversion:

"As to the particular measures taken at the time with this end, I neither know them accurately nor have I any anxiety to know them. They do not fall within the scope of my argument; I am only concerned with the principle on which they were conducted. All I say is that not all knowledge is suited to all minds; a proposition may be ever so true, yet at a particular time and place may be 'temerarious, offensive to pious ears and scandalous,' though not 'heretical' nor 'erroneous.' It must be recollected what very strong warnings we have from our Lord and St. Paul against scandalizing the weak and unintellectual. The latter goes into detail upon the point. He says that true as it may be that certain meats are allowable, this allowance cannot in charity be used in a case in which it would be of spiritual injury to others."

We quote these words as confirming by the opinion of this illustrious author the general principle for which we are contending, not as meeting all the difficulties that have been raised as to Galileo. The learned Cardinal admits that he did not know the details of the

case; if he had known them he would have seen that it was not a mere question of putting a few works on the Index because they were inopportune or because they gave scandal to weak brethren, or without assigning any reason (as is now customary); but that far graver issues were raised. Moreover, with regard to the assertion made by some writers that public opinion was so much excited by the Copernican theory at that time that it was necessary to take some steps to satisfy it and so avoid scandal, we should like to know what evidence there is for such statements, for we do not ourselves believe them to be true. A certain number of learned ecclesiastics, some, too, in high places, were no doubt alarmed; those who took their science from Aristotle were up in arms; but it is probable that the mass of the faithful knew very little and cared very little about the subject. Nor was the theory in question a mere novelty; it had been before the minds of the learned since the days of Copernicus, whose work, printed shortly before the death of the author in 1543, had been dedicated to the reigning Pope, Paul III., and had in fact been rather favorably received.

We think then that the true answer to be made to our antagonists who use the case of Galileo as a handle to attack the Church is to insist upon the *principle* that the Church has a right to prohibit the indiscriminate reading of any book, even if it contain very probable speculations and theories on physical science; but to admit frankly that a mistake was made in this particular instance, for it is obvious to those who are acquainted with the facts that the action taken by the Cardinals of the Index and the Inquisition went much beyond the mere suspension or temporary prohibition of an inopportune or imprudent work.

We doubt whether there is another instance of a work being so severely censured as was the Dialogue, considering that it bears no less than four ecclesiastical "Imprimaturs"—that of the Vicegerent of Rome with the condition "*si videbitur Reverendiss. P. Magistro Sacri Palatii Apostolici*;" that of the Master of the Sacred Palace himself, Fa. Riccardi; that of the Vicar General of Florence, "*ordinibus consuetis servatis*," and lastly that of the Inquisitor General of Florence.

There is, we believe, a memoir of Galileo written by his daughter, one of those mentioned in the beginning of our article. The book, we suppose, is a rare one, and we have not seen a copy of it. This lady was a nun in a convent at Florence or in the neighborhood, and was greatly attached to Galileo. If we are correctly informed, she quite bears out what we have already stated, that no personal ill treatment or bodily severity was inflicted on him. We need not, however, dwell upon this, as the antagonists against whom we are

writing do not, generally speaking, allege this supposed cruelty, or at least do not lay any stress upon it, their object being rather to discredit the Catholic Church than to excite feelings of pity for the individual sufferer.

We commenced our article by pleading, in justification for recurring to such a well-worn subject, that whether we like it or not it is being constantly revived at intervals and handled afresh fairly or unfairly.

An instance of this occurs at the present time. At the ancient University of Oxford there is an annual competition for an English prize poem on a given subject, and the successful competitor recites his poetry in public amidst the plaudits of his friends and fellow-students. The subject given for 1901 is Galileo. Let us hope that the youthful aspirants for this popular distinction may on the one hand avoid the temptation to assail the Catholic Church, and yet on the other hand do justice to the character of the great philosopher—the pioneer of modern astronomy.

F. R. WEGG-PROSSER.

London, England.

THE SOCIALISM OF THE SOCIALIST.

IT is often said that one way to foster a cause is to misunderstand it. Opposition which is based on misunderstanding seems to make more intense the attachment of those who believe in the cause; their enthusiasm is sustained, their sense of justice is quickened and their methods of propaganda acquire a pointedness which undoubtedly gives them force. This is noticed often in social movements. In the earlier stages the movement is vague, confused, uncertain; the details of its essential meaning are not clear because thought and feeling lack precision. Hence they who embrace it may least understand. Such a condition very naturally leads to misunderstanding which in turn invites opposition. But when the movement meets opposition it becomes introspective. The defense which is made brings about clear thinking and exact expression. Gradually the vital thought of the movement comes to conscious expression, and then force, unity and organization result. Objective study from those outside largely displaces prejudice and the movement receives dignified recognition.

These thoughts find illustration in the history of Socialism. In its earlier stages it was wild, fantastic and impossible, an air castle

in many forms built by excited dreamers. Later it was a confused mass of popular agitation, conspiracy and politics, boundless aspiration and keen economic analysis, allied by choice, accident or fate to anarchy, riot or revolution, a favorite resort for all who hated institutions and had lost reverence for the past and hope for the future. In that confused stage Socialism invited and met misunderstanding and organized opposition. It has, however, succeeded in disengaging itself fairly well from all that is more radical and all that is less radical than itself; from anarchy on one hand and from Populism, Trade Unionism and the like on the other. It is true that there are points of contact, but the differences of policy and principle are pronounced and they are understood by reflecting persons. To-day Socialism knows its own essential idea, though hopelessly at sea concerning its details. It is self-conscious, direct and aggressive with recognized methods of propaganda and a record of achievement which we may not ignore. It is the doctrine of a political party which has reached extraordinary proportions in Germany, great proportions in France, Belgium, Italy and Austria, though not yet a factor of much importance in American life. It has created a literature and a press; it has its poets, historians and economists; it has taken a place in modern life which promises it a future with which society must reckon.

Setting aside for the moment the many "socialisms" which are spoken of nowadays, we may say for present purposes that there are three Socialisms. First, we have the movement in itself; a deep, far-reaching social force whose full meaning is not yet grasped by men, working out its providential rôle in human history independently of our efforts to master it. Secondly, there is a Socialism which opponents see: minimized in what is attractive, magnified in what is hideous, illogical and defective. Thirdly, we have the Socialism of the Socialist; real, comprehensive, satisfying; its own apology and explanation, answering all questions with authority, allaying all fears with power. It does not occur to the Socialist that his prepossession converts assumptions into axioms, baseless promise into infallible prophecy, and that it has so perverted his mental tests that, as regards the present social order, criticism is true if only radical, wisdom is real if only confident and statement is true if only bold. Socialism seems to me to mean just such a mental revolution, but the Socialist is not conscious of the psychological process which brings it about. Those of us who cannot accept its creed certainly find it gravely at fault and a source of danger to society. Nevertheless, it is not our view of it that is the power. It is the Socialism of the believer, of the Socialist, that is the world movement which has won adherents, created a literature, organized parties, fought battles,

won and lost them. If we persist in taking only our own view of Socialism, our opposition to it is useless toil and vain concern. We may, perhaps, prevent it from spreading in certain directions by the attempt to show that there is in it too much reckless hope and despair. But something more is needed. We must understand the Socialist's subjective side, know him sympathetically, seek the sources of attraction other than argument to which Socialism owes much of its strength.

Fair minded observers agree that many phases of the conditions in modern life are deplorable. "Only too abundant is the harvest of miseries," to quote the recent encyclical. The evils complained of are absolute and they are not softened by any relative considerations of those who in the past suffered more or of those who in the future may suffer less. The relative view may be of service in judging institutions, but it is useless to console their victims. One of the chief factors in the situation is the distribution of wealth. Though we admit, as is maintained, that the present distribution is the best possible in the circumstances, it is at best very bad. For a century and a quarter individuals have been left to themselves and circumstances to earn their living, to accumulate property. Life has so shaped itself and institutions are so adjusted as a result that the amount of wealth which one possesses or of which one disposes practically determines one's opportunity of education, culture, health and home. We are accustomed to say that a man is "worth" a certain sum, and if the amount is large, that statement is generally the second headline in his obituary notice. Individuals are enabled to project the sphere of their influence into the future by inheritance laws which permit men to control property long after they have passed away. We cannot escape this central fact that the accident of property affects and largely controls life, crime, morals, culture, home. The struggle among individuals to acquire property has become unrelenting, fierce and almost savage, and it has charged the atmosphere with inhumanity and materialism which have affected nearly every phase of life.

Like heavy, grimy smoke, settling down on the city from which it has just ascended, on marble and granite, smirching cathedral, mansion and capitol, that social atmosphere has tainted our religious, political and social institutions to a marked degree. This was made possible by the disintegration to which social life had been subjected. The middle ages saw the organic unity of social life realized. Religion was the basic element; political, industrial, social and domestic interests were conceived as closely related, and thus organic unity was not only a fact in individual life, but as well in social life.

The first break in that social unity came in the Reformation, whose individualism practically placed religion in a secondary place in society. Political individualism followed later, reducing the State as a political force to a very restricted field. Then came the economic gospel of *laissez faire*, in which individualism pure and simple is the law of industrial action. The organic unity of social life thus destroyed, the economic forces forged ahead. The industrial war—the struggle for property—waged fiercely. The sense of the responsibility of society to the individual and of the individual to society even in economic interests was weakened. Selfishness, class antagonism, inhumanity and materialism naturally resulted and marked the history of individualism with dark lines.

Since this individualism is the antithesis of Socialism, which is merely a reaction, the fundamental relations of the two require a word.

State stands between individual and society. We may imagine a condition of society in which the individual enjoys a maximum of liberty; we may imagine another in which a minimum only is accorded to him. As a rule individuals have accorded to society as a whole the right to protect and direct them and to preserve order. Society doing this is called the State. It is the State that defines and guarantees rights, raises armies, levies taxes and punishes crime. The State can interfere much or little in any line of social activity; it can direct and even coerce individuals, or it may leave them free in matters relating to religion, education, industry and the like. When the policy of the State is to interfere as little as possible and to allow as much liberty as possible, the trend is called individualistic; when the policy of the State is to interfere extensively, control details and leave but little room for self direction, the tendency is literally socialistic. Historical development, however, has restricted the use of the terms to political and economic activity. The theory which allows the State to interfere as little as possible in industry is called Individualism, while the theory which requires that the State or society take over the entire field of industry is called Socialism.

The line of thought which the Socialist of to-day takes is something like the following: Life in society has been practically reduced to a struggle for property. The strong are arrayed against one another and the weak are their victims. In principle the State may not check the former or assist the latter, since it admits little responsibility for the economic condition of the individual. It does not limit the amount of wealth that one may accumulate nor does it measure the pangs and distress that one may suffer. Endowment, cunning and circumstances largely determine one's lot in life. The benefits of civilization are not distributed evenly to men as men;

they are distributed unevenly to the owners of property. All crimes and vice, degradation and misery, defeat and arrested development due to the struggle for property, all due to its excess or to the lack of it, must be charged to individualism.

The social condition, the number and kind of evils which mark it have become such that a radical remedy is imperative. The situation contradicts our best thinking, hence the mad struggle for property must be stopped. A plan of social reorganization must be devised which will eliminate the property motive from individual life; one which will rest on the principle that all the members of society are responsible to each member and each is responsible to all, even in industrial life. If man is social, if he has human rights and these rights spring from his nature as man, not from his ability to outwit his fellow-man in a competitive struggle, then industrial life must be in harmony, in peace. Social organization must be tender to the weak, humane to the suffering, masterful to the strong and just to all. This is possible, continues our Socialist, only under Socialism. Individualistic institutions must be banished; instead of private ownership of capital, social ownership; instead of the competitive struggle, orderly coöperation; instead of private enterprise, social direction of industry; instead of individual ownership of the product, social ownership with distribution according to some principle yet to be devised, but one which at all events will directly protect man's essential dignity and rights.

The stupendous revolution in social life which that proposition implies cannot be measured. The vastness of the project renders it vague and the vicissitudes of its history but add to the indefiniteness. Socialism is the platform of a party; it is a religion, it is materialistic; one could enumerate many forms which seem mutually exclusive. But that variety need not engage us now. For the purposes of this study we may take it as a deep, radical, comprehensive criticism of society. It holds that social conditions and institutions violate our accepted appreciations of man, his dignity, nature, rights. The right to liberty, equality, fraternity, to fullest mental, moral and physical development, to exemption from misery, degradation and ignorance, are not enjoyed except by the favored few. Socialism takes these accepted views of man and his rights and aspires to establish social institutions which will infallibly guarantee them. That being its *object*, it proposes as a *means* thereto that society own all capital, control all industry and distribute the product according to principles of justice. We thus find in the essential thought of Socialism definite ethical conceptions, economic and political doctrine and a dominant ideal.

Unfortunately for clear thinking, the word socialism is much

abused. We have the terms Christian Socialism, Catholic Socialism, Municipal Socialism, State Socialism and many more. The habit of applying the name to any reform movement, as is often done, has caused much difficulty to those who wish to think honestly and clearly. Since the movement is known, in outline at least, to all who are interested in social questions, and abundant socialistic literature is easily found, no further attempt is made to examine the meaning of the term Socialism. It may be well to quote from the recent encyclical of the Holy Father the meaning which the term has in his mind and the form in which he has condemned it:

The Socialists "would have the supreme power in a State to be in the hands of the common people, in such sort that all distinctions of rank being abolished and every citizen made equal to every other, all might have equal access also to the good things of life; the law of lordship is to be abolished, private fortunes confiscated and even socialization of the appliances of labor carried out."¹

A glance at society as we see it and live in it to-day reveals to us that dissatisfaction is well nigh universal. From every recognized centre of social influence there comes the tone of bitter discontent and disappointment. The achievements of our institutions, all that we have done for civilization, the conditions in which social forces are now operating and all the prospects for betterment fall far short of the demands that are made by the awakened and sympathetic intelligence of to-day. The complaints vary in depth, character and motive, but they are none the less marked, none the less efficient in fostering a restless desire for relief from any source.

We hear persistent criticism of society from religious centres. Professedly Christian as is our civilization, only a fraction of our people are churchgoers, and of that fraction perhaps a minority consistently accept the Gospel standards in their lives. The trend of things has relegated religion to the domain of individual concern, and public opinion is scarcely more than deferential to it. The intensity, concentration, ideals and methods of industrial life have created an atmosphere in which no religion but that of wealth can thrive. Religion, the keeper of life, guardian of its great moral purpose, the gentle firm power which holds man in check, receives his respect and directs homage to God, the Author of life—religion, the greatest fact in a man's life, is relegated without apology or regret to a secondary place in the scheme of things by the force of mere economic development. The competitive struggle, the central individualistic institution, merciless in process, savage in principle and demoralizing in effect, has no place for religion and its standards. But the need of its saving power is seen in the problems that now

¹ The English translation in the "London Weekly Register," February 1, 1901.

confront us, in the vice and crime and injustice, in the corruption and inhumanity which we behold on every side. Timidly, as an unbidden and scarce tolerated thing, it makes answer to the cry for reform.

The principles of the Gospel must be introduced into industry. We must shape our ideals according to its spirit; social powers must coöperate to make that spirit dominate in all life, and men must shape their individual lives thereon. Such is the tone of the suggestions for reform made by religion, but its voice is scarcely heard while the all but unchecked economic forces of society go on in their savage career.

Complaint comes from scientific centres. Students and teachers of social sciences who devote their energy to the careful study of society are constantly in the presence of the awful effects of the mal-adjustment of social forces. In crime, degradation and poverty they discover far beyond the individual causes which are in and of our institutions. They see in factory, tenement house, sweatshop and dreary homes; in the broken health and blighted morals of boys and girls; in injustice and oppression, the working of law and cause for which society is accountable. They see in the separation of the ethical from the economic in industry the expected fruit of our social philosophy. They write and criticize and suggest reform. Some legislation is recommended, appeal is made to public opinion, social settlements are founded, but little that is direct, searching and complete is accomplished. All feel helpless in the presence of the actual situation in society and of the massive indifference to general welfare which characterizes the public.

Complaint comes from the laboring men. They bear the burdens of civilization and share disproportionately in its joys. They are the weakest factor in the process of production, hence they are the first to feel the evil effects of the competitive struggle and the last to share in its benefits. Conscious of all this they determine to force the remedy on society by combining their powers and demanding specific reforms in their interest. They have accomplished more than any other reform element in modern life, but even their work is far from being comprehensive enough to bring social peace.

In the same way we find complaint and suggestions for reform in the press, in literature, among philanthropists, public men, reform clubs, municipal ownership leagues, political parties. The criticisms may be local or national, they may concern one phase of life or many phases, the effect is the same. Much of this bitter criticism is true, well meant and of great value; some is undoubtedly dishonest, exaggerated and selfish; all serves to foster dissatisfaction, encourage pessimism and predispose minds to radical measures. Each

criticism is based on a different perspective and naturally reform propositions do not correspond. One result is that society is keenly conscious of the presence of great evils, but hopelessly confused about reform; partly awake to the situation and helpless before it; eager for peace, justice and joy for all its members, but not knowing where to find them.

There is in the human mind an overpowering tendency to unify its conceptions. Isolated fragmentary facts tantalize. They are of no value without interpretation, and they cannot interpret themselves. We seek relations among them, uniformities, laws, cause. To this bent of the mind is due all science, all philosophy. This constant effort to systematize things reveals the fact that system possesses a great fascination for the mind. It combines two elements which are seemingly at variance, both of which appeal to us strongly, simplicity and completeness. The small mind is won by the ease with which apparently a system is grasped; the greater mind is attracted by the completeness of detail, harmony of part and simplicity established after painstaking research. That many views of reality cohere in apparent unity is very often taken as *prima facie* evidence of their truth. Whenever the mind advances from the stage of disconnected experiences or views to a systematic view; that is, when it has classified many facts and secured a unified interpretation of them, as is the case, for example, with one who accepts the theory of evolution or the organic concept of society, certain well defined psychological changes take place. Correct appreciation of detail is apt to be lost, the critical faculty suffers, judgment is biased. The mind is predisposed to accept anything which strengthens its belief in the system as such and it is predisposed against everything which seems to question its truth.

This fascination of system, then, produces certain moral effects. It becomes a "cause," enthusiasm is engendered, schools are formed and it becomes more or less of a fashion. It seems that men are constantly on the lookout for something on which to lavish devotion and expend enthusiasm as well in science as in society. Exactness, caution and sense for detail—traits of the true scholar—do not lend themselves to such devotion as readily as does system.

Never before was the world more eager for system than it is to-day. In the natural sciences, in biological sciences, in history, philosophy, sociology, the quest is for system, unification. Facts are heaped mountain high awaiting the interpretation which system alone can give. This is particularly true in the social situation. The number and gravity of our problems cannot be gainsaid; but we are at a loss to understand them and their relations. Society feels the absolute need of reform, but it cannot devise a comprehensive

and safe method which will meet the situation in all of its details and at the same time safeguard what is of value in our institutions now. Socialism presents itself to society as an answer to its petition for guidance. Dressed out with all the charm of system and speaking with the confidence of a prophet, it offers the complete and satisfying interpretation of our problems and it indicates the single simple way that leads to the peace, joy and justice for which men are longing so earnestly. It is system in criticism and system in reform; it touches the instinct in society that makes for system, and by that touch it fascinates.

It was noted a moment ago that persistent criticism is emanating from nearly every centre of social influence; from religion, science, literature, from laborers and reformers in general. But these criticisms are more or less superficial, incomplete, isolated. Socialism replaces them by one deep, radical, comprehensive, systematic criticism of our entire social organization. It has attacked our most prized institutions fearlessly and has triumphantly claimed to have found in them the immediate organic cause of all social ills. It has a place for every fact, an interpretation for every misery, a key to every mystery. It has gone more deeply; it has claimed to find in the ultimate principle on which our institutions rest, Individualism, the single final cause of all the ills from which society suffers. Everything in the maze of modern misery is traced to its cause; great problems and lesser ones, national and local, distorted motives, evil tendencies—everything is classified. To the Socialist's thinking, the analysis is perfect, the system is without a flaw. The simplicity of the criticism is unparalleled, while its apparent completeness leaves nothing to be desired; it is plain enough for the laborer and pretentious enough for the scholar. The bold and confident tone with which socialism always speaks only adds to this fascination. It has no traditions to love, no past to revere, no institutions to cling to; the advocate of the victims of civilization and of them alone, it has no source whence to draw conservatism, patience or prudence. Where the isolated and divergent criticisms which are now heard harm one another and confuse, the unified radical criticisms of Socialism lend one another strength and confirmation. Under the baton of Socialism the mighty chorus of discontent sings in balanced harmony.

Socialism is also a systematic plan of social reconstruction. It offers to replace the hesitating and insufficient proposals of many reformers by one coördinated series of radical reforms which promise joy, peace and justice to all men. Laborers aim at one kind of reform, municipal movements at another, consumers' leagues at another, but they fail to understand one another or to give effective

mutual aid. Just as the criticism of Socialism carries one down to Individualism, the plan of reconstruction leads one to the antithesis, Socialism. It sets over against the cruel inhuman principle that to-day dominates industrial life—*laissez faire*—which being interpreted means, "Every man for himself," its own fervent and humane principle that all must live for each and each for all, that man is the highest object of care in the world and that all social institutions shall be subordinated to his true interests as man. Socialism has thus given unity to the reform idea, brought into it simplicity and completeness. The socialization of industry, the distribution of wealth according to a humane principle, the guarantee of opportunity to every one, the realization of our cherished ideals of life, liberty, culture and happiness—all these are promised as easy of accomplishment under the simple plan of social reorganization proposed. While other social critics are at variance, confused, hesitating and incomplete, it is unified, definite, confident and complete; while other reform forces are offering palliatives and measures which treat symptoms and not causes, it reaches causes and gives a philosophy which promises joy, peace and justice. The contrast is not without its effect; we must not forget it.

But Socialism has attempted to draw even more power from the charm of system. It has essayed to teach an interpretation of the Christian Gospel in which it, Socialism, appears as an essential part of the large religious organic conception of life. It has insisted through doctrinal and historical arguments on the kinship between itself and Christianity, but the effort has not resulted in any great success. It has reached out in the direction of materialism—its more natural tendency—and attempted to build up around itself an imposing system of thought, of which again it becomes an organic part. It offers a unified interpretation of history through materialistic philosophy, in which it appears as the fulfilment of prophecy, the realization of all the vital upward tendencies of the past, the goal of all the struggle and war of history for human rights and growth. It has devised its own economics and politics, its own psychology and sociology, its own ethics, literature and theology. To quote Schaeffle: "In reality it is a comprehensive philosophy of life as Bebel says; Atheism in religion, democratic republicanism in the State, democratic collectivism in economics, and we may add, boundless optimism in ethics, naturalistic materialism in metaphysics, loosening of the family tie and marriage bond or something leading thereto, in the home, State education in pedagogics, general 'illumination' in instruction."²

It would not be an easy matter to say just how much influence the

² "Aussichtslosigkeit," etc., fourth edition, p. 4.

fascination of system has had in the development of Socialism. The psychological traits found frequently among its adherents would lead one to think that the influence had been considerable. Such are, for instance, the dogmatic tone, ready blindness to detail, poor critical sense, exaggerated confidence and evident bias; the "all or nothing" policy by which advanced Socialists reject "partial" Socialists, such as Fabians and all reformers who are willing to make compromise of any kind. It is sufficient to have suggested that the fascination of system is found in the movement; the purpose before us does not require that we attempt to measure it accurately.

Aside from all question of system there is in socialism a fascination of doctrine which gives it much power. It takes our best teaching on fundamental human rights, life, liberty, equality, happiness, and promises to construct a civilization which will safeguard them effectively for all men and not alone for the favored few. We have taken human rights as problems to be solved only by patient endeavor, and at best capable of but partial realization here below. We conceive man's development as toward larger liberty, greater equality and more widely-realized development, but at best the realization can be but partial and defective. Socialism takes these radical human rights as axioms; it makes them absolute and capable of actual realization. It promises that there will be liberty, equality, entire justice, not only in formal definition, but as well in fact. Wage slavery will follow political bondage to extinction, and no other form will succeed it; the aristocracy of money will follow the aristocracy of blood to a memory and there will be no other form to take its place; the struggling rich and the struggling poor will be replaced by fraternal coöperators, who will know no selfish motive and seek no selfish end. Poverty and vice and degradation and ignorance will be abolished and joy, peace and justice shall reign. "Socialists look forward to a time when three or four hours in twenty-four devoted to labor will be all that is required to supply every physical need, the remaining hours of the day to be devoted to rest and rational pleasure of mind and body, education, reading, study, the mastery of science and philosophy, music and the drama, athletics and esthetics. Now only the rich enjoy such satisfactions. Under Socialism all would be rich enough to have all the enjoyments derived from mind culture. This done, and there is no good reason why it should not be done, the world would have a new civilization and life would be worth the living."⁸

Socialism promises to make society anthropocentric; all institutions are to be devised and controlled in a way to protect human rights rather than to foster trade, as seems now to be the case, and

⁸ "Social Democratic Herald," February 16, 1901.

human labor will be no longer a commodity, bought and sold like iron or coal. In the new order man is freed from individual blame for his errors and sins. Environment is the adequate cause of all misery; release will come not by personal effort and individual reform, but by the radical reform of environment, of society.

There is another element in the teaching of socialism which is more subtle, though less conscious; one which many would admit and many would deny, yet I think a source of power. Christ in His mission to mankind emphasized boldly and unmistakably the fact that the centre of life is beyond the clouds; that man's destiny is there; that thence must be taken the only absolute criterion which fixes all values in human life. The mysteries of life—and they are many and deep—cannot be explained except thereby. Thus it is that hope in a future life and future perfection have been and is and will be forever the characteristic of Christian civilization, and Christians will look for no redemption from social ills except through Christ. Such social reform as is undertaken in His spirit and such individual reform as is strengthened by His grace, such and no other can promise relief. This is the Christian's real belief; but the world is unfortunately growing tired of it. Socialism has essayed to reach into the clouds, snatch back the centre of life and place it on earth. Rights and obligations are to be explained in and through society; the enjoyment of perfection is to be immediate; the mysteries of life are merely unnecessary problems that social reform will explain away. For many of its adherents socialism is a religion; it captivates them, seems to satisfy the higher longings of their nature. In earlier days it sought to ally itself with religion, but its tendencies seem to be decidedly away from it and into materialism. It sometimes tries to distinguish between "churchianity" and religion. It condemns the former for "hollowness and soullessness; its petrification and false pretense; its fostering of prejudices, superstition and narrow sectarian exclusiveness; its tendency to side with the powerful and strong and preach slavish virtues to the humble and lowly proletarians; its blasphemous attempts to sanctify the crying injustices of the social institutions of their time and country." Socialism can, however, see some good in religion. It "may be of great assistance to secular Socialism by arousing the human passion for righteousness, by appealing to race instincts and noble emotions, by directing imagination to a grand vista of future human bliss and happiness, of heroic deeds, of self-sacrifice and martyrdom, of fame and glory, of immortality."⁴ This attitude of socialism toward religion is not without effect, for it is a view which pleases those who are tired of restraint and seek comfortable ideals rather than high

⁴ Both citations from "Social Democratic Herald," February 16, 1901.

ones. These and similar doctrines of socialism, which it is not necessary to mention, appeal strongly to many men. Individualism had not neglected to teach men their rights and dignity, but the form in which socialism presents them and promises realization has an added force. They touch the sense of human dignity and the instinct of justice in men. The apology of individualism was progress and its highest product a perfect business man; the apology of socialism is justice and its promised product a perfect human man.

We must not forget this, we who see so much to condemn, so much to fear and so much to oppose in socialism. Send its representative into a factory where all that is repulsive and annoying and oppressive in our institutions is concentrated on poor laborers whose awakened intelligence makes them restive. Let the facile-tongued apostle whisper of sunlight and shorter hours; of brighter home and happy life; of the reign of justice and humanity and the downfall of economic tyranny; send a second man into the mines with the same enticing and soothing message; send a third into the congested districts of our cities to harangue the multitudes and give promise of culture and joy to them as soon as the hated institutions of capitalism can be destroyed; send emissaries of the new gospel in all directions. At every spot where those institutions have pressed heavily and caused distress and blighted human lives let the orators speak. Let them speak to those who have everything to gain and nothing to lose except their misery about the idleness and corruption of the rich, the sufferings and dependence of the poor and of the coming kingdom of man, to be established when they, the people, will it. Send after these apostles the apologists of our institutions as they are or as we would reform them. Send them to teach that sin and self-indulgence are the causes of much misery, that human limitations permit only partial relief, that the mysteries of life cannot be explained here below, that the laws of social growth forbid radical departures in social organization, that our immediate aim can be scarcely more than that outlined in the recent encyclical—"to make the lives of the laborers and artisans more tolerable and gradually to give them the opportunity of self-culture, so that at home and in the world they may freely fulfil the obligations of virtue and religion, may feel themselves to be men and not mere animals, Christian men, not pagans, and so strive with more facility and earnestness to attain the 'one thing needful'—that final good for which we came into the world." Let the socialist teach the people their untried strength and let us try to show them their demonstrated weakness; let the former give them enthusiasm in their suffering and let us offer them only patience. Let all of this be done and then we may wonder not that there are socialists,

but that there are not thousands where now there is one. Reason and experience tell us that we are right and that the socialist is advocating an impossibility, but there are times in life when reason and experience cannot overcome the seductions of hope and the illusions of an excited imagination. This is the case with those who suffer keenly and eagerly seek relief. Socialism enjoys certain advantages of situation which merit some attention. It is the untried ideal of attacking the defective real. It can and does concentrate all the odium which it can excite against the past on the institutions of the present. It need not discriminate as to causes, since it is not required that it be accurate in establishing relations of cause and effect in social ills. It presents itself as the champion of the oppressed and shows all the dash, vigor and aggressiveness of an ideal champion. We, on the contrary, appear to be at least indifferent to the oppressed and to be the champions of the favorites of fortune, since we preach conservatism and hold to our institutions in substance. The admitted evils of the present social organization—the economic, intellectual and moral waste, not to speak of the unnecessary suffering and disappointment which we see on every side—defy apology and invite the thought that we who defend a system in which they are possible are not the friends of mankind. The socialist need not exaggerate; the actual condition shames our institutions. He, however, cannot be criticized except theoretically, for socialism has no history as the basis of social life.

Then, too, we must not forget that the day of pure individualism is past and that socialism represents a set of principles and institutions toward which—if not to which—we are tending. The trust, the trade union, government enterprises and government monopoly have latent in them an unmistakable sign of it. Phases of our school system, such as free text books, transportation to and from school, show us the same, while all factory laws, reform legislation and the constant extension of public functions in all directions show that the drift is strong. This whole complex movement is exactly in the line that socialism has marked for itself. True, the tone and language are still individualistic, but we seem to forget that in backing out of individualism we move toward socialism. The following from Kautsky, a recognized Socialist thinker, expresses well the position in modern life which socialism marks out for itself: "The proletariat, as the lower stratum of society, cannot free itself without putting an end to all oppression and exploitation. So wherever the class-conscious proletariat has become a power, it becomes the advocate of all the oppressed, of oppressed classes, oppressed nations, of an oppressed race, as far as their interest do not conflict with those of the social evolution. Out of this historical

VOL. XXVI—5

rôle there develop for the proletariat duties which are beyond its direct class interests. But this does not fill out the circle of social duties which the class-conscious, aggressive proletariat has assumed.

"It cannot free itself by the principle of the wages system. It is necessary to put an end to the present institution of property and method of production, a high social end must be set up--and it is the only class to-day that cherish an ideal. It is the only revolutionary class, that is . . . which aims at a social ideal . . . the only class in which there is any idealism.

"Thus, out of the class struggle of the proletariat arises the highest ethical power, consecration to an ideal and the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat is the ground where the idealists of all classes . . . in modern society unite.

"The more revolutionary, the more ideal the proletarian class struggle becomes; the more it emphasizes its final aim, the greater is its ethical power, its power for the moral regeneration of the proletariat."⁸

In the preceding pages an attempt was made to show that socialism possesses the two-fold fascination of system and of doctrine and that its position gives it certain advantages which should not be overlooked. It is not my desire to make a consecutive analysis now to show just where and how these sources of attraction operate in the socialistic movement. To have suggested that they do operate is sufficient. We may then advance to a brief consideration of the question, who are the socialists?

The general answer is--the victims of our institutions and those who sympathize with them. The propertyless class is, of course, most fully represented, and by that is meant the laboring class. We must, however, take care lest an exaggerated impression be conveyed. The immense majority of laborers are really indifferent to the whole situation, at least such is the case in the United States. Not over one-ninth of them belong to organizations; the number is about 1,200,000. As a body organized labor is not socialistic; on the other hand, it is not at all opposed to socialism on principle. The columns of the labor press are open to the most active socialistic propaganda; recognized socialists are active in the movement and entire freedom is allowed to all concerning it. The labor movement has a concentrated purpose; it has set out to strengthen itself and to accomplish certain reforms. It regards socialism as a distraction, but as soon as it sees that socialism will best accomplish that purpose, the movement is prepared to embrace it. The exposition of the laborer's point of view which the writer attempted in the January *Quarterly* might be of service to those who would wish

⁸ In "Die Neue Zeit," November 24, 1900, article "Klassenkampf und Ethik."

to examine the relations of socialism to the labor movement more in detail. The brief observations here made may call attention to the fact that socialistic sentiment and sympathy for its ideals are much more widespread than many think or are willing to admit. The total Socialist vote in 1900 in the United States is reported in the press as 131,069, but the number of those who actively sympathize with all that socialism represents is very much greater. If I mistake not, Professor Ely has estimated the number in the United States as half a million.

There are certain types of temperament which are attracted to socialism. Natures inclined to hate are easily won, for such a disposition is pessimistic and the very life of socialism lies therein. The fierce denunciation of institutions, resentful criticism of all inequality in the enjoyments of the comforts of life have a certain charm for this type of man, who may pay little attention to economic doctrine or social ideals; he is content in his hate; he does not aspire to upbuild and may not even long for anything better. Those of milder type, "who live of their admirations rather than of their disgusts," find much that allures in the bright promises and buoyant enthusiasm of socialism. Idealists and dreamers naturally follow them. Fine natures which cannot easily bear the thought of pain and suffering and are angered to rage when they see villainy successful, vice triumphant and virtue persecuted or unrewarded have much sympathy with socialism. They are natures which are noble, but untaught in the school of stern reality; natures which have not yet learned that idealism is a good beacon light for civilization, but a poor foundation. I recall one socialist who in reply to my question, "What made you a socialist?" replied laconically, "Hate." He was born very poor and had suffered much. I recall a second whose love of order and harmony was so great that he became an active socialist; a third was one whose socialism was due to the massive dishonesty practiced and implicitly approved in all branches of business. I recall a fourth, who was a believer in free love and worked and wrote for socialism in the hope that the movement would further his unholy cause.

One will find that in public meetings of socialists the orators appeal often to sentiments such as those referred to. The most plausible socialist speech that I ever heard was in Chicago some years ago, when an able man addressed the socialists in a very poor quarter of the city. He merely told his hearers how the then Vice President of the United States had become a millionaire by going through bankruptcy three times. The attempt to argue socialists out of their views seems, therefore, to rest on a false assumption that argument makes the socialist. One who has had much experience

with socialists knows how useless it is to try to affect them by reasoning. Some time ago a prominent university professor made a long and learned argument against socialism before a socialist meeting in an Eastern city. When he had finished, a laborer, poorly clad, who spoke with a foreign accent, remarked, "He don't know anything about it; he never shoveled coal." If we wish to understand a man's socialism, we must study his life and know his feelings.

The course of thought has led us from the consideration of socialism to that of the socialist. If we now undertake to construct his point of view, we need only work out in detail what has been said in outline. As far as socialists come from the ranks of organized labor, their point of view is merely one more advanced than that of the laborer, but both are largely identical. There is the same despair of help through government, the same sense of resentment, of injustice, the same consciousness of a high and holy mission to save humanity. There is this difference: the laborer's analysis is less deep or less pretentious and his immediate hopes are far less high. The socialist has completed his thinking, while the laborer has not. The socialism of those who have not gone through the labor movement may be a question of temperament, of personal experience. That there may be some, many, if you will, who have reasoned themselves into socialism I do not pretend to deny; that the argument may have been poor, that it may have been skilful, is a question of fact as much as of effect. All of this is true of any argument or of its presentation; it is true of any system of thought in the world. In all life much depends on temperament and circumstance. There is much in socialism that is possible and much in it that is desirable, just as there is much in present conditions that is hideous and depressing. Hence there is an argument for the one and against the other. Without questioning the validity of either argument, we may safely question the rôle which the argument for socialism plays in its propaganda. No attempt has been made to offer an objective study of socialism; its theory of value, its view of history, psychology or politics was not examined. Nor was the purpose to show how much in socialism is helpful or how much dangerous. Where dissent has been expressed it concerned the socialism which is idealistic, comprehensive, final; it was not the intention to condemn thereby what is hopeful or useful in its essential idea. It seemed desirable to call attention to the attractiveness of socialism in the hope of awakening thought and arousing action.

The social conscience is still largely dormant in the United States. It is appalling that in the presence of the gigantic evils of modern society there should remain so much of indifference in

public opinion. Public leaders, legislatures, men high in industrial life seem not to heed the situation too lightly. Some among them are interested, but the mighty force which all could exert for the cause of humanity is not exercised at all. Difficult situations have rapidly multiplied themselves. Up from among the ranks of the victims have sprung movements and leaders who were stung to bitterness by their suffering and stirred to action by the indifference of those to whom they looked for protection. Trade unionism and socialism are the products of such circumstances. To them we must give credit for forcing society to know its wrongs. They have a lesson for us. Political and industrial leaders and legislators must admit their responsibility and come to give relief; public opinion must force them. Religion will give its aid. Its representatives must study and know conditions and interpret moral obligation to meet normal social demands. We who in and of the Catholic faith feel and know that we have the truth, and with it a superb and active organization which is the greatest social power on earth, we must rise to the occasion and meet it. We must study social science and fit ourselves; we must study the organic relation of the Church to society and form a social conscience; we must bravely follow its dictates and assist in the work of reform. The Church has already done this in Europe, but it must be done here. The age is drifting to the conviction that the last decisive test of any religion is its power to solve the social question. The test should be welcomed by us, for the Catholic Church can meet the situation and bring social peace.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Catholic University, Washington.

CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

AMONG the striking phenomena in the educational world at the present time is the movement observable in the domain of secondary education.¹ The mere numerical growth of the secondary schools is remarkable enough. Within the past decade the public high schools in the United States increased in number from 2,526 to 5,495, and the pupils from 202,963 to 476,227. This is an increase of 117 per cent. in the number of schools and 135 per cent. in attendance. The rate of increase in the number of pupils is nearly

¹ The term "secondary" throughout this paper is used in the sense which generally attaches to it in this country and in which it is used by the National Bureau of Education. It embraces the work between the grammar grades and the college.

five times that of the population of the country during the same period, and is rightly regarded by Commissioner Harris as "one of the most remarkable facts in the educational history of the decade."²

But this numerical increase is only one of a series of phenomena which evidence the action of a cause or of causes profoundly affecting the whole status of secondary education. Side by side with the growth in numbers there has been a movement making for the increased efficiency of the public high schools. The standard of scholarship in the teachers has steadily risen. The curriculum has been enriched and extended. In most places its length is now four years, but here and there it is being prolonged to six, and the strong current setting in this direction is made plain by the adoption of a resolution recently by the National Educational Association favoring "a unified six-year high school course of study beginning with the seventh grade."³ At the same time the ideals and spirit of the school have broadened, the principle of election of studies along broad lines has been introduced, and the requirements for entrance and graduation have been so raised that the claim is made that the public high school of to-day is almost the equal in these respects of the college of a generation or two ago.

The relation of the high school to the college has also undergone an important change. The original purpose of the public high school seems to have been simply to place within reach of the masses the opportunity for an education superior to that of the elementary school. The college interests were not considered. In fact, at the time the high school movement began, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, there already existed a system of secondary schools known as academies, one of whose principal objects was to prepare boys for college. To-day the public high school system, comprising 82 per cent. of the secondary students of the country, is securely linked to the State college system, and the natural evolution of the present conditions can only result in binding the two together more firmly.

Among the causes which have operated to bring about this affiliation, legislation must be mentioned. The Board of Regents, in New York, and the Boards of Education in the various States, afford familiar instances of the influence of legislation in this direction. The Accrediting System, by which the graduates of certain specified schools are admitted to a college without examination, has also contributed powerfully to the same result, and it is being practised to-day by some institutions on a scale that may help to account for their rapid increase in attendance. In 1896 there were forty-two State

² Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1898-99, p. 1,844. ³ Proceedings of the National Educational Association, 1899, p. 650.

universities and colleges and about 150 other institutions in which this system had been adopted.⁴ The University of Michigan has now 200 on its list of formally accredited schools, and more than one-half the freshmen who entered Cornell last year were admitted without examination, on the certificates of their respective high schools.⁵ Another strong influence which has made for closer union between high school and college has been their coöperation in joint associations. There is the National Educational Association, the associations for the several groups of States, besides those for the individual States, and in all of these bodies the schools and colleges meet upon common ground, discuss matters of mutual interest, and coöperate for the solution of problems common to both school and college, but which from their very nature neither can successfully solve alone. Such a problem is that of uniform entrance requirements for colleges. A plan has been formed to establish a joint entrance examination board, composed of school and college representatives, which is to give uniform examinations that will suffice for both high school graduation and admission to college, and it is now being put to a practical test by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. This is an attempt to complete, at a single stroke, the work of unification, and if successful it is likely to have important consequences. Catholic educators may watch the experiment with profit.

"Public education," a distinguished Catholic educator has said, "is a people's deliberate effort to form a nobler race of men." The position of the secondary school, between the primary and the higher education, makes it naturally the chief point of stress for the application of this progressive educative effort. The secondary school is the hinge upon which the modern educational system turns. In Germany the new ideals in education, springing from the new industrial and political conditions and the new ideals of national life, have found expression chiefly in the present movement for the reform of the gymnasium; and in France, outside of the religious question altogether, as well as in other nations of Europe, the burning questions of the day in education concern the secondary schools. In America the secondary school is more important than anywhere else. From its academic independence it is able to influence powerfully the higher education; while, through its organic relation to the primary school, it is able to reach the masses and mold their intellectual ideals. In America, as nowhere else, the public secondary school opens up to the whole people, irrespective of social conditions, the possibility of fullest mental development. It brings the rudiments of the higher culture to the threshold of every home, and offers to

⁴ Education in the United States, Vol. I., p. 125. ⁵ President Schurman's Report, 1899-1900.

every child a free and easy passage to the open gates of the college. It is preëminently "the people's college." It cannot be doubted, therefore, that the public high school movement, whose surface manifestations I have touched upon, is the expression of a popular demand for more and better education, and that it is destined to exercise a profound and far-reaching influence in shaping the education of the future.

In view of these conditions it seems opportune to inquire into the status of Catholic secondary education.

Catholic secondary schools for boys belong to three widely different classes. There is, first of all, the secondary school proper, represented by academies and high schools, whose curriculum as a rule extends no farther than the freshman year, although in the other direction it generally includes the studies of the grammar school. Many of the institutions of this class are of long standing, but a large number are of a comparatively recent date, probably one-third having been established within the past decade. Most of them are conducted by religious orders, and are entirely independent of parish control, deriving their means of support from the tuition fees of their pupils. Then, there are the high schools attached to parochial schools. These high schools consist of one or more grades of secondary work, serving as a sort of appendix to the ordinary work of the school, although they often carry the pupil as far as the freshman year. The number of these schools has increased very rapidly of late, and although their total attendance is comparatively inconsiderable and their methods often open to criticism, yet, as instancing an increasing popular demand for secondary education, and as pointing the way to a possible solution of problems of Catholic secondary education, they are worthy of serious study. Finally, there are the preparatory departments of our colleges, which still contain the majority of Catholic secondary students.

With the view of ascertaining some facts not otherwise attainable, I sent a letter of inquiry to each of the ninety secondary schools of the first class, and received replies from forty-nine. In these forty-nine schools the number of students of high school grade was given as 2,947, and of elementary grade 4,917. There were 992 boys studying Latin, and 244 in Greek. The average age of pupils in forty-seven schools when entering the high school curriculum is 14.7 years. The average annual tuition fee, if we exclude those schools that aim at educating only the wealthier classes, was found to be \$36.85 in forty schools. The number of schools not answering my letter of inquiry was forty-one. The total number of students in these last year, as given in the Catholic Directory for 1901, was 6,706. Assuming that the ratio of secondary to elementary pupils obtained

in the case of the schools heard from holds good for these also—although I think it is somewhat too high for the latter—we get for these forty-one schools 2,513 pupils of secondary grade and 4,193 of elementary. This would give a total of 5,460 students of secondary grade in the ninety Catholic secondary schools.

In reflecting on these results, one is struck by the comparatively large number of pupils pursuing the classics. Those studying Greek constitute 8.3 per cent. of the whole number of secondary pupils in the schools reporting. The percentage of pupils in the public high schools studying Greek is only 3.1.⁶ Those studying Latin are 37.5 per cent. of the whole, a number which compares favorably with the 50.4 per cent. in Latin in the public high schools, when we remember that some of the religious orders most prominent in secondary school work do not teach the classics at all, and the further fact that in the twenty-five schools reporting pupils in Latin their percentage was as high as 66.5.

The average age of entrance upon secondary studies is much higher than I had expected. It is quite as high as in the case of the public schools, and invites serious attention to the need of shortening and enriching the curriculum of the elementary school—a problem that far-seeing educators like President Eliot long ago pointed out as of fundamental importance to college as well as school.

It is interesting to compare the cost of secondary education in Catholic and in public secondary schools. The Commissioner of Education has kindly furnished me with some statistics relative to the cost of public high school education, from which it appears that the average annual cost per pupil for salaries and incidentals in ten of the principal cities of the country is \$52.44. The average annual tuition fee in forty Catholic secondary schools is, as stated, about \$37. As the only source of revenue to these schools is the tuition fees, it is safe to say that secondary education in the Catholic school costs considerably less than in the public high school.

So far as the efficiency of Catholic secondary schools of this class is concerned, such examination as I have been able to make has convinced me that they will fairly bear comparison with the preparatory schools in our colleges. There are exceptions, it is true. There are secondary schools, graduation from which would not fit for the freshman year in any reputable college, just as there are colleges whose preparatory curriculum is inferior to that of any reputable high school. But in general, making due allowance for the fact that many of our secondary schools are commercial in character, I believe that our college preparatory departments have little to offer the Catholic boy in the way of educational facilities beyond what he

⁶ Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1898-99.

can get, often nearer home and at lesser cost, in the Catholic secondary school.

Catholic high schools attached to elementary schools are represented in the current report of the Commissioner of Education by fifty-three schools, with an attendance of 646 boys and 1,342 girls. This is an average of twelve boys to a school. These schools are mostly in the hands of the various orders of teaching nuns, and are nearly all co-educational. Most of them offer four grades or years of high school work, although the average number of teachers to a school is only three. It is worthy of note that the pupils preparing for college in these high schools formed 9.6 per cent. of the whole. In the public high schools those preparing for college form 11.6 per cent of the whole.⁷ The comparatively large number preparing for college in Catholic secondary schools of this class is a fact of highest interest for college men, and suggests what might be expected in the way of increased college attendance, if we had a comprehensive, efficient and well articulated system of parochial high schools.

The list of Catholic secondary schools of this class given in the Report of the Commissioner of Education is, however, far from being exhaustive. Scattered over the country are hundreds of other parochial schools in which one or more grades of high school studies are taught, the general disposition being to keep the pupils, especially the brighter ones, as long as possible. The total of attendance, however, is not large. Thus in the Archdiocese of Boston there are a number of schools of this class not enumerated above, but the total of secondary pupils amounts, in the case of boys, to but 108. It is no uncommon thing to find a school of several hundred pupils with half a dozen or so of secondary grade, who stand in about the same relation to the rest of the school as do the "post-grads" in a small college, and who pursue their studies in much the same loose and leisurely way. Sometimes a number of these inchoate high schools are found in the same city, and we have the condition of a series of ill-supported rival establishments, where not more than a single one is needed or can be successful. In such cases, so far from the high schools being a source of strength to the parochial schools, as they could not fail to be if combined in one central, well graded institution, they become only an element of weakness and a drag, because the teaching they get, scant and feeble as it may be, has to be subtracted from that which is due the elementary grades. There is an enormous waste of energy going on in this way in our schools. Nevertheless, the attempt to project the parochial school beyond what has been hitherto regarded as its proper limits, seems

⁷ Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1898-99.

to be in answer to a popular demand, and is doubtless destined to continue. The movement is bright with possibilities, for the secondary schools of this class, however unsatisfactory and open to criticism they may be in some respects at present, constitute a firm forward step in the work of bridging over the gap that now separates Catholic higher education from the parochial schools.

In estimating the number of collegiate and secondary students in Catholic colleges, I have classed as colleges all institutions recognized as such by the Commissioner of Education, and have added such others as I could ascertain to have an actual collegiate attendance. This gave a list of sixty-eight Catholic colleges. The total number of students in these, as given in the current Catholic Directory, is 12,031. If we take the estimate of Dr. O'Malley,⁸ made in 1898 and based on direct investigation, that the proportion of preparatory to collegiate students in our colleges is as two to one, then the number of collegiate students in the sixty-eight Catholic colleges would be 4,010, and the preparatory or secondary students would number 8,021. This is somewhat more than a majority of the total number of Catholic secondary students.

The statistics of Catholic secondary schools for girls are interesting and instructive. The total number of academies for girls, given by the Commissioner of Education,⁹ is 233, with an attendance of 8,238 pupils of secondary grade and 22,957 of elementary. To these must be added 386 other academies given in the Catholic Directory, with a total attendance of 41,853. Assuming the same ratio of secondary to elementary pupils as in the case of the academies given in the report of the Commissioner, there would be 11,294 secondary pupils in these 386 academies. Besides these, there are also the 1,342 female pupils in the secondary grades attached to elementary parochial schools. This would make a total of 20,874 girls of secondary grade in all classes of Catholic schools. The number is undoubtedly somewhat too high, for some of the academies ranked as secondary schools by the Bureau of Education deserve a place among the colleges, and many others, while rightly to be regarded in the main as secondary schools, have some students of collegiate standing. As a matter of fact, there are only two Catholic institutions for girls that are recognized by the Bureau of Education as colleges.

We are prepared now to estimate the probable numerical strength of Catholic education in proportion to the total Catholic population. The following table is a summary of the results of my investigation on this point, and shows the ratio of attendance in each class of Catholic schools to the Catholic population, compared with the ratio

⁸ *Catholic World*, 50, 399.

⁹ Report for 1898-99.

of attendance in all schools of the class in question throughout the country to the total population of the country. As the ratio of percentage would be too small for the purpose of this comparison, I have chosen as more convenient the ratio of 1 to 10,000. It appears, then, that there are,

FOR EACH 10,000 OF RESPECTIVE POPULATION :¹⁰

	Elementary students.	Secondary students.		Students in higher education.
	Male and Female.	Male.	Female.	Male.
In Catholic institutions.....	898	13	19	4
In the entire United States.....	2,143	39	49	8 ¹¹

These figures show that our educational institutions, including all classes of schools except seminaries, have only from about one-third to one-half of the number of students they ought to have. Not that it is to be inferred, necessarily, that no more than this proportion of our Catholic youth are being educated. Undoubtedly, a large proportion are receiving their education in institutions other than Catholic; but I am loath to believe that the number of these is large enough to account for the above differences. Nevertheless, the explanation must be either that our Catholic youth are not getting as much education as the youth of the country generally, or that Catholic parents, to a far greater extent than is commonly believed, and in every department of education, are sending their children to institutions that are non-Catholic, or else that both of these conditions obtain, and this last seems to me the most likely explanation.

It is to be observed that the lowest level of numerical strength is reached in the case of secondary schools for boys. The attendance here, it seems, falls short by two-thirds of what it ought to be. In the case of our colleges, if we exclude from consideration the large number in non-Catholic institutions who are following what I have classed as non-collegiate courses, the attendance is just one-half of the normal. Contrary to a widespread impression, it appears that our academies for girls have less than one-half of their due proportion of secondary pupils. The number of academies is indeed very great, amounting all told to 672, but in most of them the secondary pupils are comparatively few, and probably the great

¹⁰ The population of the United States is taken for the year 1898, from the Report of the Bureau of Education for 1898-99. The Catholic population is from the *Catholic Directory* for 1901. ¹¹ The number of students represented by this figure was gotten by subtracting from the total in higher education in the United States as given in the Report of the Bureau of Education, students of law, medicine, theology, technology (in technological institutes), dentistry, pharmacy and other technical branches, and all women students, as these classes are not, as a rule, found in Catholic colleges.

majority of the academies are in the main little more than select elementary schools.

These statistics make it plain, in a concrete way, that the problem of the future for the Church in America is the problem of education. We are still far from the realization of that noble ideal of Catholic education set forth so clearly and eloquently, and with such authoritative insistence, by our ecclesiastical councils, especially the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore—the ideal of a system of Catholic schools in articulate and harmonious coöperation, numerous enough and well distributed enough to accommodate our entire school population, and embracing parochial school, high school, college and university. Much, indeed, has been done. Foundations have been laid strong and deep, all along the lines of the national system of education. Magnificent beginnings have been made, notwithstanding the general poverty of our people up to the present, and the powerful attractions of the State schools, to whose support they have been obliged by law to contribute; and the records of education the world over may safely be challenged for evidence of a zeal so great, of a generosity so self-sacrificing and sustained, of practical results so conspicuous, in the cause of learning. But we must not forget that with all this the structure is still far from being complete. It is going to take much time, self-sacrifice and coöperative effort to bring the Catholic educational system, in certain important respects, notably in comprehensiveness and unity, up to the condition of the State system of schools. In the meantime, the latter are not going to wait for us. As I have indicated, in numbers, in efficiency, in closer union among themselves and with the colleges, they are making wonderful strides. Under these conditions it will not do to simply hold our own. To halt would mean inevitably to retrograde and fall behind. If Catholic education is to continue to function as a healthful, growth-producing process in the Church's life, it must advance and expand with the advancing and expanding intellectuality of the modern world.

How shall we best apply our efforts, under these circumstances, for the improvement of Catholic education? I believe it to be by building up, as the connecting link between parochial school and college, a system of schools parallel, as nearly as may be, to the system of public high schools; and this not only because the secondary school, from whatever side we view it, is the weakest point in our educational system, but because it is through the secondary school, and through it alone, that we can effectually strengthen and uplift the parochial school and the college.

It is not difficult to see how the establishment of Catholic high schools will benefit the colleges. Whether the fact that the number

of students in our colleges is so far below the normal is to be explained on the theory that the rest go to non-Catholic colleges or do not go to college at all, or by the operation of both these causes combined, the lack of Catholic secondary schools must be considered as a cause more fundamental still. Of the Catholic boys attending the public high schools, it is inevitable that most of those who go to college will drift into the non-Catholic colleges. The gap between the public school and the Catholic college is too great. Their studies, their methods, their spirit and ideals are widely different. They belong to two fundamentally divergent systems of education. Take it in the matter of the classics, for instance. Only a little over three per cent. of the public secondary pupils study Greek. It is one of the most unpopular branches in the high school. Yet many of our colleges will not admit to the freshman class without Greek. The practical consequence is that whereas the high school graduate who has not taken Greek is welcomed to the State university, he may not be able to enter the freshman class in the Catholic college without extra preparation or irksome conditions. On the other hand, the path from the public school to the State university is short, straight and enticingly easy. The high school diploma often admits without examination. The last year of the high school is made to dove-tail into the freshman curriculum. There is no gap, no break, no jar of any kind. It is an interlocking, double-action combination. The lack of endowment in our colleges is, of course, an element of importance here. The foundation of scholarships would unquestionably operate in favor of increased attendance; but it may reasonably be questioned, I think, whether, even if our colleges were not behindhand in this respect, the fact would be sufficient to offset the strong current now flowing in the other direction, since Catholic boys would have equally good chances for financial assistance in the non-Catholic institutions.

If, on the other hand, we accept the hypothesis that the falling off of the attendance in Catholic institutions is due, in whole or in part, to the fact that Catholic youth, owing to the general poverty of our people, do not get as much education as the children of their fellow-citizens, the argument for the Catholic high school rests on reasons none the less cogent. The poverty of the majority of Catholics is a fact not to be gainsaid. It undoubtedly diminishes their opportunities for education, and is certainly responsible, to some extent, for the comparatively low attendance at Catholic institutions. But since the Church discountenances the acceptance by her children of the lavish opportunities for education offered them by the State, are we not bound to provide for them opportunities not inferior to those provided in the public schools? In a democracy like ours and in times

of universal education such as these, education is, ordinarily speaking, the measure of influence and success. To be without it is to be to that extent crippled for the race of life. To be deprived of opportunity for it is to be robbed of that which is, after religion, best and most ennobling in life. Surely we cannot look without concern upon conditions by which any class of the Church's children are deprived of educational opportunities to which they are entitled. Yet such conditions obtain. Taught to distrust the public schools, Catholic parents, in the absence of Catholic high schools, too often come to look upon the completion of the parochial school curriculum as the natural term of the mental development of the child.

The preparatory departments of our colleges are not a satisfactory substitute for a system of Catholic high schools. Purely from the point of view of college interests, much might be said against the continued union of preparatory school and college, for it may be questioned, I think, whether collegiate attendance depends so much as is commonly supposed upon the presence of preparatory departments in the colleges. A record of observation, telling how many third year preparatory boys in any given college kept on through the college course to graduation would be highly interesting and instructive. However, I am concerned now, not with the relations of preparatory school and college, but simply to state the reasons for my contention that our preparatory departments are not acceptable substitutes for Catholic high schools in the case of pupils who do not intend to go to college—and it is pupils of this class that constitute nine-tenths of all secondary students. Besides the fact that the day colleges are neither numerous nor well distributed enough, the distance between the parochial school and the college is too great. The absolutely private character of our colleges, so far as management is concerned, seems to make anything like close affiliation with the parochial school system a difficult if not an impossible matter. Moreover, the curriculum of the preparatory school looks chiefly, if not solely, to the interests of boys who are fitting themselves for college. In many colleges no attempt whatever is made to reach out after the great mass of boys of secondary grade, by providing courses of study that shall offer opportunities to fit more directly for active life. But the chief reason that militates against the preparatory departments is the fact of expense. Education cannot be given as cheaply, grade for grade, in the college as it can in the secondary school. The average annual tuition fee of \$37 in forty of our secondary schools, including many of the strongest schools of this class, is far less than the average annual tuition fee for day scholars in the preparatory departments of our colleges; and it is to be noted that the tendency in many col-

leges is steadily towards the increase of tuition and other fees. I am aware that some colleges in the larger cities have reduced their rates to a comparatively low figure and are making heroic sacrifices in order to give the children of the poor a chance; but, speaking generally, the cost of tuition and its inseparable accompaniments in college preparatory departments puts it entirely beyond the reach of many parents who could and would send their children to a free or cheap Catholic high school. How many there are who are prevented in this way from giving their children an education superior to that of the parochial school, may be a matter for dispute; but it is worth remembering that an investigation made some years ago in the case of the public high school pupils in a number of the principal cities of Massachusetts, revealed the fact that fully 25 per cent. were children of parents who were too poor to possess taxable property.¹²

Parochial schools, even more than the colleges, will benefit by the establishment of a system of Catholic high schools. "Progress," says Bishop Spalding, "spreads from the summits." The greatest need of the parochial school at the present time is the stimulus that would come from affiliation with a superior school. The impetus given to parochial school education by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore has largely subsided, and there is evident in many quarters a growing spirit of indifference. The number of pupils, which increased very rapidly in the decade immediately following the promulgation of the decrees of the Council, is still less than one-half of the normal, and in the last half dozen years, as the tables of the Catholic Directory prove, the increase in parochial school attendance has not kept pace with the increase of the Catholic population.

Nor have the expected results followed from the general adoption of the elaborate scheme of examination and supervision devised by the Council. The practical difficulties in the way of the efficient enforcement of the plan are immense, and although a great deal of progress has been made in some dioceses, in many others things run on much the same as before the examining boards and committees were appointed. In many places the parochial schools are still deplorably in need of definite and regular grading. There is much confusion in the matter of text-books, preventing any approach to a common standard of grades. Many of the religious orders have their own series of text-books, and in the larger cities, where the religious orders often work side by side, the variety of text-books is a frequent source of trouble and expense. The influence of a Catholic high school, with which all the parochial schools of a city would

¹² *Educational Review*, 2, 48.

be affiliated, would tend to eliminate these and similar defects. It would set the standard of a definite quantity and quality of work, and school grading and substantial uniformity in grades and text-books would follow as a matter of course. Above all, the Catholic high school would benefit the parochial school by strengthening and elevating its tone, by awakening a sense of healthful ambition and rivalry in both pupil and teacher. Experienced parochial school teachers with whom I have discussed the matter assure me that it is this lack of tone, due to the absence of conditions that inspire intellectual ambition, that constitutes the most deadening and difficult evil they have to contend against. A boy who is ambitious to go to the high school will do better work, as a rule, than one who is not, and parochial school teachers would find in the establishment of Catholic high schools a most effective remedy for the pupil's disinclination to home study. The annual entrance examination for the high school would become a test of the strength and competitive standing of the various schools, and would spur the teachers on to the best possible work in their respective spheres. These convictions, I may add, are not based upon fancy or speculation, but are the result of a careful study of the influence of Catholic high schools actually existing, and of the views of those most competent to discuss parochial school conditions and problems the country over.

I have said nothing thus far about practical plans for overcoming the difficulties in the way of the establishment of Catholic high schools. The difficulties are certainly not slight, but the chief difficulty does not consist in any lack of practical plans. There are several admirable plans in successful operation, that may be studied in the concrete by any one. There is the plan of the free, endowed high school, such as the magnificent Catholic High School in Philadelphia; there is the free high school supported by the funds of the parish or parishes, as in New England; there is the high school supported by the tuition fees of the pupils, and in charge of a religious order. There are plenty of religious men and women for the work of Catholic secondary schools, and with the inevitable evacuation of the field of the parochial school by religious men, these ought to be available in increasing numbers for their greater, more pressing and more proper work in the secondary school.

The main obstacle in the way of the Catholic high school movement lies deeper than the question of means. It is due rather to widespread lack of faith in the utility and desirability of Catholic high schools, and it is not confined to the laity. Pastors who are zealous enough in the cause of the parochial school disavow belief in the necessity or possibility of Catholic high schools, and

VOL. XXVI—6

permit without scruple the attendance of Catholic children at the public high school. Men in the walks of higher education look with coldness or disfavor upon the project of a system of Catholic high schools, out of the fear that they might injure existing institutions. The result is apathy and indifference well-nigh universal.

And yet what sound reason can be given, outside of the reason of necessity, why the Catholic parent should be freely allowed to send his child to the public school in the one case and strictly forbidden in the other? Is there less need of the religious instruction and moral tone of the Catholic school for the boy of 16 than for the lad of 12? Are the dangers of companionship less great in the public high school than they are in the grammar school? Does the subject matter of the lessons or lectures bear less upon matters of morals and religion? As a matter of fact, it is in the high school that the boy gets his first world-view of things. Literature and history are the two eyes through which the soul scans the universe of human life. Is it tolerable that the view may be distorted or colored for the Catholic boy by non-Catholic bias? If history and literature may be studied in the public school without danger to faith, why may not, with greater reason, grammar and arithmetic? If the boy of 16, with his ripening passions and impressionable moral nature, may live in a "godless" atmosphere without harm, why may not the boy of 12, with his less developed impulses to evil? And the same argument would apply, with no less truth and cogency, to the question of higher education. There is really no more reason to prevent a Catholic boy from going to a non-Catholic college than there is to prevent his going to a public high school. The logical applicability to parochial school and college of any general principle that may be admitted for the secondary schools is too plain to be missed by even the most ignorant, and the present widespread attitude of indifference in respect to Catholic high schools must, if continued, extend eventually to the parochial schools and the colleges, and profoundly affect the entire system of Catholic education.

It is because of the realization of this that our ecclesiastical councils, in conformity with the instructions of the Holy See, have insisted so strongly and steadfastly upon the necessity for a complete system of Catholic schools, along the lines of the national education, and that our ablest and most far-seeing leaders are devoting so much of their practical efforts in education to the building up of Catholic secondary schools in their respective dioceses. The vast expansion of public secondary schools in recent years, the rapid educational evolution going on visibly about us, with the possibility of the complete unification of all public education, makes the question of Catholic high schools, with which that of the systematization

of Catholic education is intimately bound up, a vital and a pressing problem for Catholics. It commends itself especially to the attention and earnest study of Catholic educators. The present conditions are abnormal and illogical, and, in the nature of things, must operate to the detriment of the religious as well as the educational interests of our people. In the words of one whose abilities and experience entitle him to rank as an authority: "There is far less danger in allowing young children to attend the ward schools and young men to attend the non-Catholic technical schools and universities, than in permitting the frequentation of the non-Catholic high schools and academies. We believe it would be better to frankly accept the public school system as a whole and make special provisions for supplying its deficiencies in religious teaching than to expose our children to the influence of a dual system."¹³

JAMES A. BURNS, C. S. C.

Washington, D. C.

TWO CENTURIES OF CATHOLICITY IN DETROIT.

THE authentic documentary records of two centuries of Catholicity in Detroit commence with the dedication of a chapel in honor of the mother of the Blessed Virgin on the festival of Ste. Anne, July 26, 1701.

The locality was the high bluff on the northwestern littoral of the strait, through which flowed the crystal waters of the great lakes above on their way to Lake Erie, twenty miles below.

The ceremonies of dedication were performed by two venerable priests, Father Constantin D'Lhalle, Recollet, from the monastery of this order at Quebec, and Father Francis Vaillant de Gueslis, S. J., *ci devant* Iroquoian missionary, from the Jesuit College of Quebec.

The attendants at this ceremony comprised fifty officers and soldiers of the army of France and the same number of artisans and agriculturists selected for colonists from the sparse settlements of Canada, comprising the initial expedition of the Chevalier La Mothe Cadillac, who had been commissioned by Louis XIV. to establish a colony and fort *sur le d'etroit du Lac Erie, en lieu avantageux*.

The surroundings of this religious ceremony may be accurately described. The commandant, the Chevalier Cadillac, was an adept in North American frontier experience; he was also a fairly qualified engineer. As a site for the nucleus of the intended colony he had outlined a square of four acres on a plain of the high bluff overlook-

¹³Rev. John T. Murphy, C. Sp. S., in *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 22, 461.

ing the strait where the stream was narrowest. On the water front he had enclosed with palisades 200 square feet, on which was erected a bastioned fort, on the right and left of which had been mounted the two small cannon which had been brought from Quebec, so as to command the approach by water from up or down stream. From a high mast planted on the esplanade of this little fort floated the lilled flag of far distant France.

The four acres had been enclosed with high palisades with pointed tops, while the land front of the square as well as its sides were protected with loopholed watch towers. A strong double gate on the land side permitted entrance or exit from or to the forest bordered plain beyond. Inside the enclosure a circular road had been outlined, called in military parlance *le chemin de ronde*; this was patrolled by sentinels day and night.

The defensive works had been named Fort de Pontchartrain, in honor of Count Jerome of that name, Minister of Marine and Colonies in the Cabinet of Louis XIV. The enclosure within the *chemin de ronde* had been laid out in narrow streets, on which had been built the dwellings of the commandant and his officers, the chapel of Ste. Anne, the priest's house and the storehouse.

A row of lesser dwellings provided shelter for the artisans and farmers, while the soldiers were lodged inside the fort. The construction of these buildings was necessarily simple and more or less uniform. They were built, says Rameau, "of square hewed timber fresh from the forest, the pieces of equal length were laid one over the other, like in mason work," perforated for doors and windows and provided with good sized hearths and chimneys. They were roofed with bark and made habitable and comfortable by the methods usual in frontier settlements. The male sex alone comprised human life, while not a domestic animal could be found in the little colony, neither horses, cattle, swine or sheep!

With the exception of Captain de Tonty, second in command, who was an Italian, the community was solidly French. The intended colonists were mostly from Normandy, while the commandant was a typical Gascon.

It is to the honor, while it is due the memory of Louis XIV., as well as of his predecessors and particularly of their respective Cabinet Ministers, to testify from authentic records, as also from the royal edicts issued from time to time, to their solicitude for the spiritual welfare of those of their subjects who left their homes in France and crossed the ocean to become colonists in the founding of the new empire on North American soil. But their Christian charity is still more in evidence by the substantial arrangements made for the conversion to Christianity of the aboriginal occupants and rulers of

the country over which France had assumed political control by right of conquest.

The Jesuits and Recollets entered the missionary field in North America early in the seventeenth century and made progress; but their small bands were forced to return to France by anti-Catholic hostility. Cardinal Richelieu determined to extend missionary work in North America with headquarters at Quebec. He invited the Capuchins to undertake the work. The superior of this branch of the Franciscan Order in Paris at the time, judging from the experience of the Recollets, deemed the service too hazardous and declined to peril the lives of his brethren; but he advised the selection of the Jesuits for such heroic work. Under such auspices the latter order entered the missionary field and were joined later on by the Recollets.

Dr. John Gilmary Shea, who recites these facts, states that he saw and read in the archives of the *Bureau des Terres* at Quebec the passport signed by Cardinal Richelieu of the first band of Jesuit missionaries who came from France to Quebec.

The policy of the rulers of France during all their subsequent political history in their new empire in North America was charitably appreciated and substantially supplemented by wealthy Catholics, who contributed liberally and who not only established foundations for permanent annual incomes in support of missionary and educational work, but who likewise continued to devote each year certain portions of their wealth for such work as long as France controlled affairs in her American colony.

Under such favorable auspices was the Catholic religion founded in Detroit two hundred years ago! How different from the subsequent parochial beginnings in other American communities, where the Catholic faith was proscribed by English colonial laws and where its faithful adherents were compelled, surreptitiously, at infrequent occasions, when a priest was available, to assist at the Holy Sacrifice and enjoy the sacraments in private houses and out-of-the-way localities!

The venerable and subsequent martyr Recollet, Father D'Lhalle, had been appointed *aumonier* of the expedition of La Mothe Cadillac by Governor General de Calières; he in fact was the founder of the Catholic religion in Detroit.

The presence of the Jesuit Iroquoian missionary, Father Vaillant de Gueslis, as stated, as participant in the ceremonies of the dedication of the first chapel of Ste. Anne was by the direction of the father superior of his order at Quebec, who had been asked by the Governor General to send a Jesuit missionary conversant with Indian dialects with the expedition of the Chevalier Cadillac.

When, however, the venerable father superior learned from authentic sources that the intention of the Chevalier Cadillac was to bring the Lake tribes, most of whose members had been evangelized by the Jesuit missionaries, whose centre of operations had for many years been at Michilimacinac, to new homes in the vicinity of Fort de Pontchartrain, it became evident that the system of the Lake missions perfected by the zeal as well as by the martyrdom of some of the most eminent of the fathers of the Society of Jesus in North America was menaced with disruption by depopulation, while in their new homes in the vicinity of a colony of whites their spiritual control would be wrested from the missionaries, who would become subordinate to the commandant of the colony, the father superior did not hesitate to send by trusty messengers instructions to Father Vaillant for his immediate return to Quebec, which he accomplished before the end of the year, much to the annoyance of the Chevalier Cadillac.

Some years previous to the events related the Chevalier Cadillac had been appointed by Governor General Frontenac military commandant at Michilimacinac, which at that period in the history of New France was a post of political as well as of strategic importance in relation to the nations of her Algonquian allies. It was situated on the main land at the conjunction of the straits of the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan and opposite what is now known as the Island of Mackinac.

This locality had long been the centre of the missionary operations of the Jesuit Fathers, who had evangelized the Indian nations on the littorals of the Lakes Huron, Michigan and Superior, whose tribes had made it their rendezvous while making their canoe voyages to or from Quebec. It was also the depot of the Western fur trade, where cargoes for this traffic were received from Quebec by way of the Ottawa river and Georgian Bay route and distributed, and where the furs received in return were assorted and prepared for shipment by way of the same route to Quebec and thence to France.¹

The capital invested in this hazardous commerce, which at the time extended to Hudson's Bay, was large; but the profit realized was great. The local traffic was quite remunerative, so much so that the military commandant, the Chevalier Cadillac, was tempted surreptitiously to engage therein. His heroic wife at Quebec obtained by loan partly a sum of 5,000 livres, which she invested in *eau de vie* and goods for the Indian trade, which she had freighted on large trading canoes and shipped to her husband at Michilimacinac. It is very doubtful if the Governor General had knowledge of this illicit operation. With this stock, with his prestige as commandant

¹ This traffic was exploited by the monopoly of the "Canada Company."

of the military post, the Chevalier became largely interested in its local traffic.

The most profitable article sold by the French fur trader to the Indians at the time was *eau de vie*. The unlimited traffic in this *fire water*, as it was called, resulted disastrously to the Indian and to his family. The first to realize its ruinous effects to the bodies and souls of their neophytes were the Jesuit missionaries. They protested to the commandant first, but without result; and in turn to the colonial authorities at Quebec, from whom they received no redress. They then appealed to Louis XIV., and with such success that the traffic in *fire water* at Michilimacinac was to a great extent suppressed. The epistolary controversy growing out of this result is known in French colonial history as the "Brandy War." Prominent in the correspondence relating thereto was the Chevalier Cadillac, surreptitiously interested as he was, and he does not figure to advantage; but the success of the Jesuit Fathers in their humane crusade made themselves and the members of their order the mortal enemies of the Chevalier Cadillac. He was subsequently relieved of his command at Michilimacinac and returned to Quebec.

Such had been the antecedents of the founder of the colony of Detroit. His ability as well as his courage cannot be questioned.

But the success of his plans for the formation of his colony would run counter to the interests of the great monopoly of the Canada Company, which by royal charter had the exclusive control of the trade of New France on land and at sea. It would interfere with their control of the fur trade in the West and Northwest. Their wealthy directors in Paris had powerful influence at court; the result of their intrigues was that the civil and commercial control of the young colony was taken from the Chevalier and given to the representatives of the company.² The equally potent directors at Quebec were instructed to carry into effect this arrangement and to install their factors at Detroit. Besides this combination there was a religious opposition, which was less demonstrative, but still formidable. The father superior of the Jesuits could not favor a colony whose success during the second year of its existence resulted in the depopulation of their missionary fields centering at Michilimacinac. During six years the functions of the Chevalier at Detroit were minimized to that of commandant of the troops; he had succeeded in inducing the Lake tribes to leave their homes and settle in the vicinity of the post, but since the eclipse of his power his influence over these tribes had waned.

He had been cited to appear before the Chancery Court at Quebec, where for several years he was annoyed with litigious persecution

² The commandant was inhibited from sharing in the trade of the colony.

until he finally succeeded in bringing the situation of affairs to the knowledge of Count de Pontchartrain, with the result that the privileges of the Canada Company were withdrawn, their agents removed from Detroit and the Chevalier restored to the full control of the colony, with a liberal grant of money for its development. He then actively recruited the colony by inducing emigration from Canada and by liberal grants from the royal bounty to settlers for agricultural needs.

In a few years the colony was in a flourishing condition, but in 1710 the Chevalier Cadillac was promoted to the Governorship of Louisiana, and he departed forever from the scene of his greatest success. It was no friendly interest that brought about this result. In the meantime the first chapel of Ste. Anne, with other buildings, had been destroyed by fire in 1703. It was rebuilt on a larger scale, but a few years later, while the post was in danger of attack, the second chapel had to be destroyed for strategic reasons; a third and larger chapel was built by the Chevalier Cadillac. During the enforced absence of the latter at Quebec the first pastor of the colony, the saintly Father D'Lhalle, was treacherously murdered by a hostile Indian; his martyr blood consecrated the soil on which the Catholic faith had been first established in Detroit. The same year the Recollet, Father de La Marche, arrived and succeeded to the pastorate of Ste. Anne; he retired in 1709 and was succeeded by the Recollet Father Deniau.³ Thus religious service, with but slight interruption, had been continuous.

The line of Recollet pastors continued unbroken until the closing decades of the eighteenth century.⁴ The colony of Detroit had continued to increase during French colonial rule and had developed on both littorals of the strait. In 1728 the Jesuit Fathers had reappeared; Father Armand de La Richardie, S. J., established the *Mission des Hurons du Detroit* on the south littoral, which was continued until the last of the Huron missionaries, Father Pierre Potier, S. J., was accidentally killed in 1781. With Recollets on one side of the strait and the Jesuits on the other during nearly a century three generations of Catholics had lived in the faith. In the meantime important political changes had occurred.

The fine Empire of New France had been lost to the mother

³ We are indebted to the Abbe Gosselin, of Quebec, for a copy of his discourse before the Royal Society of Canada, the subject of which was: "Un Soldat de Frontenac Devenu Recollet," in which the romantic history of Father Deniau is outlined. While pursuing his theological studies at the seminary at Angers an unfortunate accident occurred which rendered flight necessary, and he took refuge in Paris, where he enlisted as a soldier, and was subsequently sent with a detachment of troops to the army of Frontenac at Quebec. The Governor, learning of his history, secured his appointment as professor in the Seminary of Quebec, from which institution he was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Laval, December 3, 1700. ⁴ See "The Recollets at Detroit During Nearly All the Eighteenth Century," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. xxiii., No. 92, October, 1898, p. 759.

country on the Plains of Abraham; subsequently the lilled standard of France had been lowered on this frontier to the British conquerors, while the Northwest became an adjunct of the English colonies.

The conspiracy of Pontiac ensued and in time the American Revolution; the strait now known as the Detroit river became the national boundary line; the north shore was American and the south British.

In 1796 the British forces evacuated Detroit, and the Bishop of Quebec⁵ ceded his spiritual sway to the future Metropolitan of the United States, Right Rev. John Carroll, of Baltimore, over Detroit "and its dependencies."

From this event dates the progress of the Catholic religion in Detroit, as well as the foundation of spiritual and educational progress among the people of its dependencies from the head of Lake Erie as far west and northwest as Lake Superior.

The disciples of St. Francis had prepared the soil and the disciples of St. Sulpice reaped the first harvest under American episcopal jurisdiction.

The Sulpitian, Very Rev. Michael Levadoux, was the first incumbent of Ste. Anne's under Bishop Carroll; he was recalled to France two years later and succeeded by Very Rev. Gabriel Richard, who had for his assistant his brother Sulpitian, the accomplished and subsequent historian, Rev. John Dilhet.

With two such holy priests and accomplished men religion and education were developed in Detroit and the widely extended field of its parochial dependencies. Father Richard found the fourth church of Ste. Anne too small to accommodate the local parishioners; so also were the school buildings. He enlarged all three and built academies for young men and women, while he and Father Dilhet instructed teachers of both sexes for the education of young men and women in the primary and higher branches. He then made pastoral visits to missionary stations on the American littorals from the head waters of Lake Erie to the Sault de Ste. Marie, remaining several weeks at the Island of Mackinac, whose population of whites, half-breeds and Indians he found in a demoralized condition. This tour occupied six months and enabled him to report to Bishop Carroll the population as well as the spiritual status of all under the jurisdiction of Ste. Anne's of Detroit.

He then, with his assistant, began the instruction of his local parishioners for the reception of the Sacrament of Confirmation, which, during the months of July and August, 1801, was, by invitation of Bishop Carroll, administered to 521 persons, whose ages ranged

⁵ Right Rev. Jean Francois Hubert, D. D., who was *of* *devant* pastor of Ste. Anne's, Detroit.

from thirteen to eighty years, in the Church of Ste. Anne by Right Rev. Pierre Denaut, D. D., twelfth Bishop of Quebec. In June, 1805, the church, academies, presbytery and schools were destroyed by the fire which in a few hours wiped out of existence the old colonial town of Detroit.

Many priests would have been utterly discouraged by such a calamity, which was disastrous alike to pastor and immediate parishioners, but Father Richard, although saddened at the material loss to religion and to his people, made great efforts to assist the latter and provide food and temporary shelter. He soon obtained possession of a large building a mile below the former city, which he arranged for religious services and for his presbytery. His academies and primary schools were reopened and better arranged. The former were supplied with first-class chemical apparatus. In a school especially designed for the education of Indian girls these were instructed in the minor rudiments, while a dozen spinning wheels and other technical appliances were provided for their use, which were designed to prepare these girls with a practical knowledge useful in their future life. In 1809 Father Richard set up the first printing press in the West, and by the aid of Mr. Coxeshawe, a practical printer whom he had brought from the East, he published a series of religious and educational books in French and in English and French, which were sold at a moderate price and which replaced the books which had been destroyed by the fire of 1805. The War of 1812 ensued. Father Richard, who was American in all essentials save his nativity, was, contrary to the usages of war, arrested by order of General Brock, British commander, and taken in irons to the prison at Sandwich, on the opposite side of the strait, when Detroit was surrendered. The farmhouses and dwellings of the well-to-do parishioners of Ste. Anne up and down the American shore were plundered and their floors and fences used for the camp fires of the Shawnee Indian allies of his Britannic Majesty.

The battle of the Thames ended this last episode of British rule on American soil. When Father Richard was liberated and returned to Detroit he found his parishioners on the verge of starvation. They had been robbed of their stores of food and of grain; they had neither seed-grain nor vegetables to plant in their fields.

The credit of this venerable apostle was such that he was enabled to purchase the requisite supply of food and grain, which he distributed; the danger of famine was averted by his prompt and active assistance and his spiritual children were soon restored to their former comfortable status.

The spiritual control of Detroit and its dependencies had in the meantime been vested in the See of Bardstown, Ky.

Father Richard, like other saintly prelates and priests in Eastern cities, experienced annoyance from scandals caused by rebellious trustees. But these afflictions did not occur in the parochial corporation of Ste. Anne's Church, Detroit.

In 1808 Paul Malcher, a wealthy bachelor, donated a farm one-quarter mile in width and three miles in length, extending from the bank of the river to the forest, for religious and educational purposes, situated at the *Cote du Nord Est*, two miles above Ste. Anne's. The deed was made to a syndicate of his neighbors, who, like himself, were good Catholics. In 1809 a church and school were built on the river front and a parish was organized, taking the name of the *Cote du Nord*, with the parties named in the deed as *marguilliers* or trustees. This little church was of great convenience to Catholics living in its vicinity, some of whom lived four or five miles from the Church of Ste. Anne. It became a succursal of the latter and divine service was held therein on Sundays and festivals by Father Richard or his assistant.

In the new plan of Detroit Ste. Anne's corporation was assigned, in exchange for its former holding, a square now in the centre of the present city as a more extensive site for church and cemetery, which was acceptable to the pastor, to the *marguilliers* and to the parishioners generally and formally accepted; the front of the old site, including the ancient cemetery, being included within the lines of the present Jefferson avenue, was ceded to the city, while the rear portion, fronting on the southerly line of the present Larned street, was left to Ste Anne and subsequently sold as a nucleus for the fund for building the new church on the new site.

It was stipulated by the corporation of Ste. Anne that the remains of the dead in the ancient cemetery would be removed to the new cemetery. These transactions were bitterly opposed by a faction of the *marguilliers* of the *Cote du Nord* parish, which developed into open schism. The great majority of the people of the little parish were faithful to their revered pastor, but they were made to suffer the consequences of the action of their trustees.

The Right Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget, D. D., was Bishop of Bardstown at this period. A deputation went to Bardstown and both sides were heard. Bishop Flaget sustained Father Richard, and issued in 1817 a *mandement*,⁶ which is a model document of episcopal jurisprudence, addressed to all the faithful at Detroit and vicinity, placing the *Cote du Nord* church and parish under interdict unless certain formalities were complied with.

It was a dread sentence, but the recalcitrant *marguilliers* remained

⁶ A copy of this document is on record in the parish register of Ste. Anne, of Detroit.

obdurate. In the following year the heart of the saintly prelate was moved with compassion for the destitute condition of so many faithful Catholics. He made the journey from Bardstown to Detroit⁷ and soon had the satisfaction of reconciling the rebellious ones with their venerable pastor. The *mandement* of the Bishop was accepted by the *marguilliers*; a grand procession, headed by the regimental band, was formed, which conducted the Bishop from Ste Anne's through the city, the cannon of the fort firing a salute as it passed to the *Cote du Nord*. An affecting reconciliation took place between the schismatics and their venerable pastor, Father Richard; addresses were delivered in English and French and the interdict was formally removed by Bishop Flaget and a handsome amount subscribed for the fifth Church of Ste. Anne, the cornerstone of which was laid by the Bishop June 11, 1818.⁸

In 1822 the saintly Dominican, Father Edward Fenwick, was elevated to the newly-erected See of Cincinnati, under whose spiritual jurisdiction was placed Detroit "and its dependencies." The building of the new Church of Ste. Anne imposed a heavy burden upon its pastor; its basement was first dedicated in 1820 for divine service, and the upper portion so far completed that it was dedicated on Christmas, 1828. It was a large and imposing structure at that time; having two towers in front and rear and a large dome in the centre, it dominated all other buildings and was a conspicuous landmark to the traveler in his approach to the city by land or water.

In 1823 Father Richard was elected by a decisive majority as the third territorial representative of Michigan to Congress. He accepted the office with a view to utilize its salary in completing Ste. Anne's. His appearance in the House of Representatives created a sensation; his demeanor commanded great respect. "He spoke but little, and that wisely, and did much for his constituents and the Union."⁹ Through his efforts the military roads from Detroit leading to Chicago, the Grand River Valley, Lakes Michigan and Huron were built by the Federal Government, over the lines of which have since been constructed the iron roadways which connect the East with the West and open Michigan to the commerce of the world. While in Washington he solicited and obtained government aid for the maintenance of schools among the Indian tribes under his jurisdiction.

In July, 1824, Father Richard made a tour of the lake missions. While at Mackinac he visited the site of the Jesuit missionary station at Michilimacinac of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He located and marked the grave of Father Marquette, he visited

⁷ This tiresome journey was made in the saddle. ⁸ Spalding's "Life of Bishop Flaget," pp. 182-187. ⁹ See the *Congressional Globe* of 1823-24.

all the island missionary stations and the Sault de Ste. Marie. Returning by way of Saint Louis, he went to Cincinnati, where he assisted at the ordination of Rev. Francis Vincent Badin, with whom he returned to Detroit. This young priest, learned, accomplished and pious, subsequently became the assistant and solace of the venerable Father Richard.¹⁰

With the coöperation of Bishop Fenwick the missionary work among the Indian tribes of the Lake regions was developed. Father Francis Vincent Badin was sent to the Ottawas and Pottawatomies; the circuit of these missions included the littorals of the islands of Lakes Huron and Michigan, of the Georgian Bay and the littoral of Lake Michigan, which included the site of the present city of Chicago.¹¹

The same year Fathers De Jean and Bellamy arrived from France, volunteers for the Indian missions of the Lakes. After a course of linguistic instruction at the presbytery of Ste. Anne these young priests were assigned to the missions on the Lakes, relieving Father Badin, who returned to Detroit. Father de Jean subsequently evangelized the Ottawa tribes and restored them to Christian life.¹²

One of the most zealous priests sent from Cincinnati by Bishop Fenwick to Father Richard for missionary work in the lake regions was the Rev. Frederick Résé, who, as a preliminary for this work, underwent a course of study of the Indian dialects at the presbytery of Ste. Anne. He was an apt scholar in Indian linguistics.¹³ The same year, 1826, Father Badin was sent to Wisconsin to revive religion in the former missionary fields of this region. He extended his visits as far North as Prairie du Chien, where he restored the former missionary establishments, comprising a population of about 600 souls.

This was the hardest work the city bred priest of Orleans had experienced in America, but he accomplished much. After his return to Detroit he resumed parochial work in the parish of Ste. Anne and in the succursal parish of the *Cote du Nord*, thereby relieving Father Richard of much routine work.

In the meantime the missionary field had been extended from the islands and littoral of the Georgian Bay up the River St. Mary to the

¹⁰ He was a younger brother of Rev. Stephen Theodore Badin, the first priest ordained in the United States. The brothers were natives of Orleans, France. ¹¹ Ann. Prop. 11, p. 247. ¹² Ibid., p. 344. ¹³ Dr. Frederick Résé was born in Hildesheim, in the Kingdom of Hanover, Germany, in 1797. In his youth he was a soldier and served as a minor cavalry officer in the corps of Marshal Blücher at the battle of Waterloo. After the eclipse of Napoleon he resigned the sword to take up the cross. He entered the College of the Propaganda at Rome and studied for the priesthood; he earned the title of D. D. and was ordained. He was then sent to Africa on missionary service, and on his return to Rome he offered himself to Bishop Fenwick, first Bishop of Cincinnati, as a volunteer for missionary work among the Indians of Michigan. He arrived at Cincinnati in 1825 and became secretary to the Bishop.

Sault and across Lake Superior to its head waters at Fond du Lac, including the littorals of the islands and main land of what now constitutes the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, parts of Minnesota and of Wisconsin. This extensive region was almost exclusively inhabited by the tribes of the once great nation of the Chippewas, whose people, alternately freezing and starving, were probably among the most miserable of the human race.¹⁴ The indefatigable Father Résé was recalled to Cincinnati and was promoted by Bishop Fenwick to the office of vicar general of the diocese. He had become thoroughly posted with the missionary work directed from Detroit by Father Richard and the pecuniary requirements necessary for its vigorous prosecution which were not available at the time. He was authorized by Bishop Fenwick to go to Europe in 1828 and solicit pecuniary assistance for religious work generally, but especially for Indian missionary service among the tribes of the Lake regions, for which he was to solicit volunteers. He went directly to Vienna, where he had influential friends.

Among others he interested the Archduchess Leopoldine of Austria, who exercised considerable influence at the Imperial Court and among the wealthy nobility of the empire. Under the patronage of this Imperial Princess the Leopoldine Society was founded and capitalized liberally for the promotion of the missionary work of the Diocese of Cincinnati operated from Detroit.

Financial assistance from other wealthy Catholics was also received for the same objects. Being thus assured of pecuniary aid from the annual allocations of the Leopoldine Society, and reinforced as stated, he sought and obtained volunteers for the sacerdotal part of the missionary system, with whom he returned to his diocese. The square which had been assigned the corporation of Ste. Anne by the judicial and civil authorities of the city and territory was extensive. On the south it fronted on Larned street, while it was bounded on the north by Michigan Grand avenue, since renamed Cadillac Square; on the east by Randolph street, and the west by Bates street.

On the southeast corner of Larned and Bates, 100 feet north of the former street, had been built and completed the spacious church known as the Fifth Ste. Anne, which, as stated, had been dedicated on Christmas, 1828. On the east, on the Randolph street front, about 100 feet north of Larned street, had been built and completed the presbytery of Ste. Anne; on the northeast corner, the Academy of Ste. Anne, for the education in the higher branches of young men, while across Larned, on the corner of Randolph, was the young

¹⁴ See "The Chippewas of Lake Superior," *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. xxi., No. 82, April, 1896, p. 354.

ladies' academy. On the east side of Randolph were free primary schools for boys and girls.¹⁸ The presbytery was a three-story frame building about 70 feet square. A hall 10 feet wide extended through the centre of the first and second stories, on each side of which were good sized rooms. The third story contained three bed rooms and a large room in which was the historic press of Father Richard, the depository of his published books and of his precious manuscripts.

A broad path extended from the rear of the presbytery to the basement entrance of the church. The Larned street front and the Bates street front to the rear of the church was enclosed by an open fence. From the south of the presbytery a path led to the Larned street side, by which the young ladies of the academy and their teachers had access to the church. On the north a similar path led to the entrance of the Academy of Ste. Anne. The south front of the square was reserved for garden and orchard, while north of the path to the entrance of the church referred to was the second cemetery of Ste. Anne, covered with tombstones and containing the bones and ashes of the Catholic dead of 125 years. The remainder of the square was enclosed with a high board fence.

In the Catholic annals of the Northwest the presbytery of Ste. Anne was historic. It was the home of the Venerable Father Richard and of his distinguished confrère and immediate successor, Father Badin. It was the abiding place of the saintly Bishop Fenwick when this prelate made his apostolic periodical visitations. It was the preparatory school, the alma mater, of the zealous young priests who came from Europe to serve as missionaries among the Indian tribes of the Upper Lake regions, where they were instructed in the Chippewa, the Ottawa and the Pottawatomie dialects, a far more difficult study than that of the classics during their collegiate experience.

The greatest missionary work accomplished under the direction of any one Bishop or priest in North America during the first three decades of the nineteenth century may be claimed for Father Richard. In fact, in no part of the United States was there a field so extensive or so difficult of access as that confided to his care under the metropolitan administrations of Archbishops Carroll, Neale, Marechal and Whitfield and under Bishops Flaget and Fenwick.

The dependencies of the parish of Ste. Anne of Detroit extended from the River Raisin, at the head waters of Lake Erie, along the littoral of the straits of Detroit, Lake St. Clair and tributary streams; Lakes Huron and Michigan, as far as the River St. Joseph, and on

¹⁸ These institutions evidence the continuous educational policy of Father Richard.

the Illinois border where Chicago has since been built. In Wisconsin as far north as Prairie du Chien and the country tributary to Green Bay it included the islands of Lakes Michigan, Huron and the Georgian Bay, and up the River St. Mary to the Sault, and around the head waters of Lake Superior to Fond du Lac. With the passing of the century, during the early part of which Father Richard directed the planting of the faith in the extensive territory we have generally outlined, there now exists, in Michigan, the Dioceses of Detroit, Grand Rapids and Marquette; in the other States, three archiepiscopal provinces, seven dioceses, with a total Catholic population of over two million souls.

In the summer of 1832 the Asiatic cholera afflicted Detroit, then badly prepared to resist an epidemic. The Catholic population felt its ravages most severely, for many among them were strangers and poor people. Fathers Richard and Badin devoted themselves to the sick and dying day and night, administering the Holy Sacraments and burying the dead.

During the two months in which the pestilence raged the venerable pastor allowed himself but little rest. When first attacked by the dread disease he was saved for the time, but he never fully recovered, and died without pain September 13, 1832. There were present during his last hours Bishop Fenwick, Fathers Badin, Baraga and Hotsher, the pioneer Redemptorist of the West. His remains were deposited in the crypt beneath Ste. Anne's, which he had labored so long and so hard to build and which he loved so well.

Father Badin succeeded to the pastorate. Father Richard was tall and spare; his face seemed like parchment, so little flesh was there on his high cheek bones, his forehead prominent, his bearing dignified and graceful. His confrère, Father Francis Vincent Badin, was similar in appearance and as gentle mannered. Both were perfect types of the ascetic priests who brought to our shores more than a century ago the fervent faith and charming manners of the *ancien régime* of Catholic France. Fifty years succeeding his death the local historian, Bela Hubbard, placed upon the massive façade of the City Hall of Detroit four statues designed to commemorate the men most identified with the exploration and the civilization of the West in their respective epochs. These were the soldiers of the cross, eminent members of two great religious orders, James Marquette and Gabriel Richard, and of the chivalry of old France, Robert de La Salle and Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac.

Preceding the demise of Father Richard it had been decided by the American hierarchy to erect the Diocese of Detroit, the mitre being intended for Father Richard; but Divine Providence decreed otherwise. The venerable appointee for the episcopate of Detroit

was spared the burden of such well deserved honor and called to a never ending celestial reward.

March 8, 1833, the Diocese of Detroit was established. The Very Rev. Frederick Résé, D. D., vicar general of Cincinnati, was appointed to the see; but it was not until October 6 of the same year that he was consecrated by Bishop Rosati, in the Cathedral of Cincinnati.

In the meantime the first Bishop of Cincinnati, the saintly Fenwick, had died September 26, 1832, while his successor, Right Rev. John B. Purcell, was consecrated October 13, 1833.

At the time of his consecration Bishop Résé was in his 36th year. His personal appearance was not ascetic. He was of medium height, while his military career had left him square built and erect. His countenance was pleasing, with bright black eyes and closely curled crow-black hair. He was a fair type of manly beauty, while his manner was agreeable.

From the time of his nomination to the newly created see the Archduchess Leopoldine of Austria became his patroness and the benefactress of the Diocese of Detroit in all that related to the personal and religious appointments of the young Bishop. It may be claimed that no Bishop in the hierarchical history of the Church in the United States assumed control of his diocese under more favorable auspices than did the first Bishop of Detroit. His episcopal wardrobe was of the finest; his respective suits of vestments were of the richest procurable in Europe, while the linen and lace appurtenances thereto were in keeping. The chalices and patins for his personal use were of solid gold; his crozier, mitres, cross and ring were resplendent with costly jewels; the ciborium, monstrance and chalices for sanctuary use were of massive silver fire-gilt, as were also the censers, cups and cruets. The altar was appointed with solid silver fire-gilt candlesticks and candelabums; the sanctuary was richly carpeted, while its walls were hung with pure silk brocattelle arras, every square yard of which must have cost fifty Austrian florins.

When Bishop Résé came to Detroit to assume possession of his see he brought with him two Oratorian Fathers from their house in Belgium, destined to establish a college for the education of ecclesiastical students and young men. These were John de Bruyn and Louis F. Van den Poel, both in the prime of life. With the Oratorians, as members of the faculty of the intended college and as theological students, were Francis Boens, Thomas Cullen, Lawrence Kilroy and William Olwell. In addition to this religious ensemble was John Pontius, intended as sacristan and master of ceremonies, familiarly known as "Brother John," who was a fine basso

VOL. XXVI—7

and a great wit, and to complete it were Revs. Bernard O'Cavanagh, intended for pastor of the English speaking Catholics, and Martin Kundig, of Swiss nationality, but a fluent and accomplished preacher in the English, German and French languages, intended for pastor of the Catholics of German nationality. Added to this clerical company were John B. Schick, a young Polish exile, professor of music, who was to be organist; a brother professor from New York, who had a fine tenor voice; Miss Martha Levi, a recent convert from Judaism and a fine alto singer, and Miss Julia O'Cavanagh, sister of the priest above mentioned, who was a fine contralto singer.¹⁶

It might be claimed that the episcopal as well as the religious establishment of Bishop Résé was complete for the purpose intended. It was not only so, but at the same time it was cosmopolitan and of the highest attainable standard of excellence. But this was not all. Captain Alpheus White, an established architect of Cincinnati, had with his family accompanied the Bishop.

This gentleman of the Irish family of this name prominent in the American history of New Orleans had once been a privateer captain, sailing in the Gulf of Mexico, who after the War of 1812 had removed to Cincinnati, in which city he had acquired a fortune in his adopted profession.

The experience of the Bishop during his military career had probably been such as to convince him that the commissary department of any expedition was a feature which required attention. He had accordingly brought with him a chef whose familiar household name was "Charlie," but whose family name we never knew. We have mentioned that a large section of the Larned street front of the domain of Ste. Anne had been reserved for a garden and orchard. To develop this appendage the Bishop had brought from Cincinnati a professional gardener named Ferdinand Erb. We remember him well. He was a tall, good natured German and not too stingy with his ripening fruit.

The young ladies of the episcopal colony were cared for in the academy for their sex, on the southwest corner of Randolph and Larned streets. Professor Schick and his confrere were lodged with a Catholic family in the vicinity. Captain White built a residence on the east side of Randolph street, while the Bishop and his *entourage* occupied the *ci devant* presbytery of Ste. Anne, which had become the episcopal residence of Detroit. Captain White re-modeled Ste. Anne's and built the College of St. Philip Neri, on the river front of the *Cote du Nord* church farm, to which the Oratorian

¹⁶ These accomplished and beautiful ladies subsequently married the brothers James and John Watson, who were among the leading Catholic merchants of the city.

Fathers with their faculty removed and opened the collegiate work which attracted a number of students.

The Bishop also brought with him Mr. Charles Schwab, a competent organ builder of Cincinnati, who erected his little factory on the eastern line of Ste. Anne's domain, and with his skilled workmen built the largest organ for the Cathedral at that time in use in the United States. All these details are authentic. They are not given upon traditional authority, nor have we any knowledge of any printed account of them.

We write them *de science certaine*. It may be asked where the money came from? It was supplied most liberally from Vienna. And from this city the United States Consul General Schwartz¹⁷ sent a fine processional fire-gilt cross to the first Bishop of Detroit, which is still in use.

In the spring of 1834 Captain White was authorized to purchase a site for a church for the Irish and English speaking Catholics. This he did on the northwest corner of Bates street and Michigan Grand avenue. About the same time he purchased from the First Protestant Society of Detroit their large frame church on the northeast corner of Woodward avenue and Larned street, which he had moved to the Bates street corner. But before this building could be remodeled for Catholic worship the Asiatic cholera again appeared and became epidemic in Detroit. In the meantime the population of the city had been considerably increased by newcomers from the Eastern States and from Europe. Large numbers of the latter were Irish Catholics. There was no hospital at the time in Detroit. The unacclimated of the poorer classes fell victims in large numbers. The Bishop directed Captain White to prepare the vacant church for hospital uses, which he did, and Father Martin Kundig was placed in charge and empowered to succor the stricken ones without regard to race or creed. In this noble work Father Kundig was substantially assisted by Charles C. Trowbridge, Mayor of the city, and by the active coöperation of the medical faculty of Detroit.

In the annals of charitable work in Detroit the heroic work of Father Kundig in connection with this temporary Catholic hospital earned for him the title of the Apostle of Charity in Detroit.¹⁸

In the summer of 1835 the remodeled church was dedicated to the Holy Trinity and Father Bernard O'Cavanagh was installed as pastor. Ste. Anne was the first, Holy Trinity became the second and in time the most populous parish in Detroit. The numerical

¹⁷ The Consul at Vienna was a brother of General John E. Schwartz, of Detroit.
¹⁸ Father Kundig procured an ambulance and visited the parts of the city most infected daily. He removed the stricken ones to his ambulance, drove to the church hospital and carried the patients in his arms to the ward assigned them.

preponderance of the Franco-American Catholic population of Detroit proper from this period was ended.

The Oratorian college of St. Philip Neri became a prominent feature of the religious life of Detroit. At this time there were but fourteen priests in the entire diocesan territory committed to the young Bishop's care and not more than twelve churches. Bishop Résé established two convents of the Poor Clares, one at Detroit and the other at Green Bay, Wisconsin. He also established schools for the Indians and made great efforts in behalf of their spiritual, their social and their temporal welfare.

This was the golden period in the early history of the Catholic religion in the city of Detroit during the nineteenth century. The pontifical service in the Cathedral of Ste. Anne under the management of "Brother John" during the term of Bishop Résé surpassed in its splendor that of any church in the United States, Baltimore not excepted. It was only during the past three decades that its religious pomp and grandeur has been excelled.

The relations of the Bishop with the indigenous Franco-Catholics was of the most cordial nature. In all the improvements which had been effected they had not been called upon to contribute a dollar. In 1836 he obtained from the *marguilliers* a lease for himself and his successors in the episcopate, under certain conditions, for 999 years of all the temporalities of the corporation of Ste. Anne.¹⁹

In the spring of 1837 Archbishop Eccleston convoked the Third Council of Baltimore. At this early period the American hierarchy comprised ten prelates, but when the Council was opened nine only were present. At the first secret session the following letter from the Bishop of Detroit was submitted:

"Most Reverend Fathers in Provincial Synod at Baltimore assembled.

"It is known that I reluctantly accepted the episcopal consecration, and I soon learned by experience that the erection and administration of a new diocese, with its numberless difficulties and cares springing up on every side, were a burden far too great for me to bear, and I have accordingly frequently entertained the intention of resigning my diocese into the hands of His Holiness the Sovereign Pontiff, or at least soliciting a capable coadjutor from the Holy See. This intention I desire to carry out by these presents, and for this purpose I have empowered my two actual vicars general, Messrs. Badin and De Bruyn, to exercise joint jurisdiction in my absence until other arrangements are made.

"Such is the matter which I deem proper to lay before you, Most Reverend Fathers, and I beg you to excuse me if I cannot take part in this Council, and also to aid me to obtain the successful realization of my desires, if it shall seem good in our Lord.

"FREDERIC RÉSÉ, Bishop of Detroit.

"St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, April 15, 1837."

The deliberations of the fathers upon this letter ended in a resolve to ask the Holy See's acceptance of Bishop Résé's resignation and the appointment of a new Bishop as successor to his see in Detroit.

¹⁹ We saw this lease finely written on parchment two feet square and framed in glass during the "forties" in the office of James A. Vandyke, counsel of the Bishop.

This was refused at Rome, the Holy Father deferring a decision as to the acceptance of the resignation or appointment of a successor until Bishop Résé had been heard in person. These events were unknown to the Catholic community of Detroit. The causes impelling the Bishop to resign the mitre of Detroit must have been serious. They were not warranted by diocesan affairs in Detroit, for all was tranquil, properous, while the Bishop was idolized. In the Third Council there were nine prelates, eleven distinguished theologians, most of whom subsequently attained high rank in the hierarchy; the heads of the Jesuits of Maryland and the Missouri provinces and five minor officials. It is a remarkable fact that all have passed to eternity without disclosing the secret of the Council in regard to Bishop Résé, while no Catholic historian has been warranted in assigning a reason for this serious event.

The Bishop returned to Detroit, and two years later, in 1839, he embarked at New York on a Havre packet ship on his way to Rome. He had as *compagnon de voyage* as far as Paris Pierre J. Desnoyers, a wealthy French Catholic merchant of Detroit.

The influence of the friends of Bishop Résé at Rome appears to have been potent, for he retained his title as Bishop of Detroit and enjoyed a revenue from his diocese during his life. He remained in the Eternal City until forced to leave during the Revolution of 1848. He died in Hanover December 19, 1871, in his 75th year; but his mental faculties had been clouded for some time previous to his death.²⁰

In the meantime one of the founders of the College of St. Philip Neri, the Oratorian Father Van den Poel, had died January 28, 1837. His obsequies in the Cathedral of Ste. Anne were among the last of the grand ceremonials performed by Bishop Résé. On September 11, 1839, his associate and the president of this college, Father John de Bruyn, also died.²¹ This left Father Francis Vincent Badin sole administrator of the Diocese of Detroit.

The grand pontifical ceremonies of the Cathedral of Ste. Anne were ended with the departure of the young and brilliant Bishop Résé. While the indigenous Franco-Catholic community of Detroit increased from natural causes, the cosmopolitan Catholic element was being rapidly multiplied by immigration from the Eastern States and from Europe.

²⁰ Captain White, in grief at the departure of his friend the Bishop, sold his property and returned to Cincinnati. "Brother John," as well as "Charlie," the chef, also returned to the same city. ²¹ The remains of both these Oratorian fathers were deposited in the crypt beneath Ste. Anne's. When in 1886, after the sale of the property and the fifth church of this name was demolished, the remains of Father Richard were translated to the vault beneath the new and splendid sixth church of this name. The remains of the two Oratorian fathers were given a final resting place in the square reserved for the burial of priests in Mount Elliott Cemetery, while those of General Antoine Beaubien were removed to the burial place of this family in the same cemetery.

The cares and responsibilities of the saintly administrator developed more and more, while he appealed to Baltimore and Cincinnati for relief. In the meantime the zealous Father Kundig in his charitable zeal for the welfare of the orphan victims of the Asiatic cholera had become involved in hopeless financial embarrassments and had retired to Milwaukee, where he became vicar general. The Revs. Anthony Kopp and Clemence Hammer succeeded to the spiritual direction of the German Catholics. In 1840 Father Badin obtained from Antoine and Monique Beaubien the donation of a half square on the corner of St. Antoine street and Monroe avenue as a site for a German church and presbytery, and early the following year the corner-stone of St. Mary's Church was laid, which was soon after completed. For four years Detroit was without a resident Bishop. The position of coadjutor and administrator had been offered to several prominent ecclesiastics, who had declined, alleging as a reason that they did not care to occupy a see whose titular Bishop was in the prime of life and who might return to assume control. Finally the position was accepted by Rev. Peter Paul Lefevere, at the time a missionary in Missouri and Southern Illinois. He was born in Roulers, Belgium, April 30, 1804. Educated for the priesthood, he came to St. Louis in 1828, where he completed his theological studies and was ordained by Bishop Rosati in 1831. He was consecrated November 21, 1841, at Philadelphia, by Bishop Kenrick as Bishop of Zela, coadjutor Bishop of Detroit and administrator of the diocese. He came immediately to Detroit and assumed control. He was then in his 38th year.

In the following year the saintly Father Badin returned to his native city, Orleans, France, where he died at a mature age. Bishop Lefevere soon after appointed Rev. Peter Kindekens, a young priest from his native province, vicar general of the diocese.

The want of priests was the first great difficulty which confronted the new Bishop. To supply this want he brought a number of ecclesiastical students from Belgium and Holland, who were instructed in theology by the vicar general and in the English language by such American professors as could be obtained.

In 1843 the States of Illinois and Wisconsin were removed from the jurisdiction of the See of Detroit. Of the theological students at the College of St. Philip Neri Messrs. Boens,²² Cullen and Olwell had been ordained by Bishop Résé. Messrs. Lawrence, Kilroy, Charles Van den Drieschen, who entered the Society of Jesus in Cincinnati, and Francis Halpin were ordained by Bishop Lefevere in 1842. In the spring of this year the college was struck by lightning

²² This young priest, of an excellent Belgian family, died from malarial fever at the college soon after his ordination.

and entirely destroyed by fire. The faculty and students were cared for at the episcopal residence in Detroit. The church had been saved, but a few years later it was closed and rented for storage purposes.

This was the end of the collegiate institution established by the learned Oratorian Fathers. The site of the college was on the bluff of the shore of the Detroit, a fine location, directly opposite, perhaps a quarter mile distant, from the northerly shore of what is now Belle Isle Park, which at the time was marshy and probably was the cause of so much sickness at the college.

After the departure of Father Badin Vicar General Kindekens became pastor of the Cathedral of Ste. Anne. His pastorate continued for some years, but it was not altogether harmonious. On the festival of SS. Peter and Paul, 1845, the Bishop laid the cornerstone of his new Cathedral on the northeast corner of Jefferson avenue and St. Antoine street. The extensive site had been paid for before the ceremony had been performed. On the same festival, which was that of his patron saints, June 29, 1848, the Cathedral was dedicated by Archbishop Eccleston, of Baltimore, who was assisted by a large concourse of prelates and priests. Its ensemble had been completed and paid for as the work progressed without calling for assistance from the Catholics of the city.²³ It is a spacious edifice, having a frontage of 80 feet on Jefferson avenue and extending on St. Antoine street 180 feet to Larned street.

A year previous Bishop Lefevere's staff had been increased by Rev. St. Michael Edgar Evelyn Shawe, a distinguished priest from the University of Notre Dame, a fine scholar and linguist as well as a most eloquent preacher. It will be remembered that Bishop Résé had served under Blucher as a cavalry officer at the Battle of Waterloo. Father Shawe, who was of noble British descent, had commanded a squadron of British cavalry in the same battle under Wellington, and left grievously wounded on that bloody field. He subsequently studied, was ordained a priest and was one of the volunteers secured in Paris by Bishop Bruté for missionary work in Indiana.

As the Cathedral had no parochial territory proper, the Bishop transferred the congregation and records of Trinity Church to SS. Peter and Paul's, which he made the parish church of all the English speaking Catholics of the city. Trinity Church was closed.²⁴

²³ This church had been designed by Very Rev. Father Kindekens. The Bishop did not like its interior arrangements and expended \$15,000 in remodeling and improvements. Its tower as originally designed still remains incomplete. The organ, the second largest in the United States at the time, was built by Henry Erben, and cost \$6,000. ²⁴ The vacant church was subsequently removed to Sixth and Porter streets, where it was rededicated under the same patronage and soon became the parish church of the Irish Catholic nationality in the western part of the city.

The Cathedral congregation was mostly composed of American born and of Irish-American Catholics as well as those of Irish nativity, the latter preponderating. From its pulpit English sermons only were preached; French in Ste. Anne's and German in St. Mary's.

When every detail connected with the opening of his new Cathedral had been cared for the Bishop resumed his episcopal visitations, which usually required from four to six months. His territorial circuit included the Lower and Upper Peninsulas of Michigan. In the discharge of this duty he traversed the State from the Detroit river to the shores of Lake Michigan in one direction, and from Lake St. Clair to the head waters of Lake Superior. Now in the open boat from Mackinac around the coasts and islands where were still to be found the remnants of the Indian tribes, and further up among the hills of the mining regions of Lake Superior to seek out the scattered Catholics and to see to their spiritual wants; again in the Lower Peninsula in the uncomfortable wagons and coaches, over roads barely passable for man or beast, to serve his flock, baptize the little ones and to bring the sacraments to the isolated Catholics wherever to be found in the growing settlements of the time. In July, 1853, the burden of the episcopal visitations was much lightened by the separation of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan from the Diocese of Detroit; its creation into a Vicariate Apostolic and subsequently into the See of Marquette, with the Apostolic Bishop Baraga in charge. That same year the Catholics of Detroit mourned the untimely death of Father St. Michael Edgar Evelyn Shawe.

In the meantime, by the liberality of Monique and Antoine Beaubien, who donated the ground, St. Mary's Hospital was established. The Poor Clares had left the city and had been replaced in their former convent by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, who organized St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum and conducted a school for girls. The Academy of Ste. Anne had ceased to exist, but the education of youth had been confided to the Christian Brothers, who opened their school in the basement of Ste. Anne's. The Diocese of Detroit had at the time sixty churches, thirty-four priests and a Catholic population of 85,000. In his titular city Bishop Lefevere from time to time, as the city increased in population, had the happiness to dedicate new churches and to witness the growth of the local Catholic population. At his suggestion, with the coöperation of Bishop Spalding, of Louisville, the subsequent Metropolitan of Baltimore, the American College of Louvain, Belgium, was established, whose first rector was Monsignor De Neve, of Detroit. Vicar General Kindekens soon after joined the rector and remained at this college until his premature death.

The episcopate of Bishop Lefevere extended from November,

1841, to March 4, 1869, the date of his death, at St. Mary's Hospital, where in a poorly furnished room, after laying aside his high prerogatives of the episcopate of a great city and diocese, he humbly came to prepare for eternity. His mortal remains have since reposed beneath the main aisle of the Cathedral he had built, which he had loved so much. There were at this epoch in the history of Catholicity in Detroit eight churches and other parishes in formation, St. Mary's Hospital, the Michigan State Retreat, several asylums, convents, academies and schools.

The administration of the diocese devolved upon Vicar General Peter Hennaert,²⁵ who was relieved upon the advent of Right Rev. Caspar Henry Borgess, consecrated at Cincinnati by Bishop Rosecrans April 24, 1870, Bishop of Calydon and coadjutor administrator of Detroit, with the right of succession, which he succeeded to on the death of Bishop Résé in December, 1871. Bishop Borgess was born in the Grand Duchy of Oldenberg August 1, 1826. At the age of 13 he was brought by his parents to Cincinnati in 1839. In this city he studied for the priesthood and was ordained by Archbishop Purcell December 8, 1848. He was pastor of Holy Cross Church, at Columbus, Ohio, during ten years, when he was recalled to Cincinnati, where he became rector of the Cathedral and chancellor of the archdiocese, which positions he filled until his accession of the See of Detroit. He was pious, zealous and conscientious. He appointed Rev. Henry J. H. Schutjes chancellor of the diocese.²⁶ This young priest, who was an able financier, had been placed in charge of the fiscal affairs of the diocese by Archbishop Purcell on the death of Bishop Lefevere. Under his management the *chancellerie* of the Diocese of Detroit was first organized and systematized, to the great relief of Bishop Borgess.

"The memorable pastoral letter of the Bishop in 1873 addressed to the priests and people on the subject of parochial schools was at once the declaration of his policy on that subject and, so to speak, the *mot d'ordre* to priests and people. The present advanced condition of Catholic education in the diocese is due to that pastoral and Bishop Borgess' adherence to the policy indicated in it."

May 19, 1882, the Diocese of Grand Rapids was created, separating the western half of Michigan from the territory of the Diocese of Detroit. In this diminished territory there remained 139 priests and 155 churches.

Bishop Borgess reintroduced the Redemptorists to Michigan. His most memorable work was the introduction of the Jesuits in

²⁵ Father Hennaert was among the theological students from the native province of Bishop Lefevere, by which he was ordained. Obit., 1880. ²⁶ Father Schutjes was one of the theological students brought from Holland by Bishop Lefevere and ordained at Detroit.

Detroit. He conveyed to this order his Cathedral, his episcopal residence and a valuable property on the northeast corner of Larned and St. Antoine streets, the understanding being that the order would assume the pastoral care of the Cathedral parish and establish a college.

These implied conditions were carried out. The Bishop then purchased a church on Washington avenue, which he had refitted for Catholic worship and which he dedicated to St. Aloysius. He then built a spacious episcopal residence on the opposite side of the avenue. Upon the return to Europe of Father Schutjes the Rev. Camillus P. Maes was appointed chancellor, and so remained until 1885, when he was elevated to the vacant See of Covington, Ky.²⁷ He was succeeded by Rev. M. P. J. Dempsey. In the meantime Rev. Edward Joos, of Monroe, was made an additional vicar general. Bishop Borgess possessed the love and esteem of the Catholic population of Detroit. This was made evident by his enthusiastic reception on the evening of his return from a visit made to Rome. Every congregation of the city was marshaled to greet his arrival at the central depot. A double line with burning torches was formed on Jefferson avenue as far as SS. Peter and Paul's, through which the carriage of the Bishop and his escort was driven, while a splendid display of fireworks added inspiration to the scene, and the cheers of the immense assemblage manifested the joy of the people as they greeted their Bishop's return. The progress of religion during the episcopate of Bishop Borgess is shown by the following summary: In Detroit there were twenty churches with parochial schools, served by forty priests; the extensive establishment of the Detroit College, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers; the Academy of the Sacred Heart; the academy, convent and asylum of the Felician Sisters; the spacious hospitals and asylums of St. Mary and St. Vincent; several educational establishments of a high order and a Catholic local population of 80,000. In the diocese at large there were 137 priests, 164 churches, fifty-seven parochial schools and a total population aggregating 125,000.

Bishop Borgess resigned April 16, 1887.²⁸ He died at Borgess Hospital, Kalamazoo, which institution had been established by his bounty, May 3, 1890, in his 64th year.

The last decade of the nineteenth century was made memorable in the history of the Church in Detroit during the two centuries of its existence by the appointment of Right Rev. John S. Foley, D. D., as fourth Bishop of the diocese. He was the protégé of the Cardinal

²⁷ Prior to the departure of Bishop-elect Maes he was honored by the Catholics of Detroit with a public ovation, when he was presented with an episcopal outfit of such costly appointments as evinced the love and esteem in which he was held.

²⁸ Vicar General Hennaert and Joos assumed control of the diocese.

Archbishop of Baltimore, by whom he was consecrated in the historic Cathedral of this metropolitan city November 4, 1888. There were present at this magnificent ceremony more than 100 priests, six monsignors, nineteen Bishops, three Archbishops and a lay delegation of twenty of the prominent citizens of Detroit. Among the priests present were nearly all the pastors of the churches of Detroit. The sermon was preached by the Most Rev. Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia.

It was claimed at the time that this grand ceremony had a dual signification ; that while the Cardinal Archbishop thus manifested his high esteem for his protégé, Bishop and diocese shared the honors.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

Detroit, Michigan.

SAINT ENNODIUS AND THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

II.

THE murderous riots, which were organized by the disappointed factionists, were the immediate occasion of King Theodoric's visit, but the cautious conqueror of Italy had been long awaiting a plausible opportunity that circumstances might spontaneously offer to take formal possession of the old capital of the empire, and to strengthen the foundations of his throne by resting it on the cheerful support of the Roman Senate and on the solid attachment of all the people, nobility and democracy. He surrounded himself with all that pomp and magnificence, gorgeously equipped cavalry and splendid chariots, which the old Romans loved and admired so much ; and, like their conquering heroes of happier days, he halted at the city walls, where he was met and accorded a princely reception by the Consuls and proud Senators in their rich official robes. The orator selected to act as spokesman, representing Senate and people, was the most distinguished Roman of his day, Böetius, the author of the well-known work, "The Consolation of Philosophy." On his father's side he belonged to the ancient and renowned stock of Manlius Torquatus, and on his mother's to that of the Severini. His illustrious birth, his brilliant eloquence, his sterling character and his abilities as a statesman raised him to the highest honors and dignities that the city and the King could bestow. Eventually his unflinching assertion of his fidelity to the Church won for him the crown of martyrdom. His address of welcome to Theodoric, called a panegyric as Greek pronouncements of such a

character were designated, was worthy of the historic occasion and of the illustrious monarch. In him and in Avienus, one of the Consuls for that year and a former pupil of Ennodius, the Pope possessed two warm and uncompromising supporters. No sooner had the royal visitor been received within the walls than he proceeded to pay his respects to the Roman Pontiff. During his prolonged sojourn of six months in the Holy City the flames of strife were smothered; only, however, to break out more violently than ever as soon as his intimidating presence was removed. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the agents of dissension left no scheme untried to secure the King's favor during his long stay in the city; but their outrageous conduct repelled his sympathy, while their hollow protestations failed to shake his just convictions.

The renewed outbreak of riot and violence following the withdrawal of the King and his numerous retinue of soldiers caused the peace-loving Pontiff to offer spontaneously to submit to the judgment of a duly convened council of his brother bishops the whole question of the incriminations fabricated against him. With a view, therefore, to terminate the tumult and scandal, even at the expense of humiliating himself in the most self-sacrificing manner, he wrote, as already explained, begging the King to summon the bishops to Rome and promising to place no obstacle in the way of their fully and freely deliberating and arriving at a definite decision. It will be readily understood how much more conveniently and effectively the King could call together all the prelates than could the Pope in the existing circumstances; but, of course, the convocation was due to the Papal authority and initiative.

From the acts of this third Council we gather that the first session was held in August, 501, when Pope Symmachus presented himself at the very opening and explained that the assembly had been canonically convened, since the King, whom he thanked most cordially, had acted in strict conformity with his request. Two points, however, he would insist upon preliminary to a judicial hearing of the charges brought against him: first, that the Visitor should at once and permanently withdraw, since the existence and presence of such an official were manifestly uncanonical; secondly, that he himself should be reinstated in the possession of all the property and treasure of which the intrigues and violence of his enemies had deprived him. Both these demands were applauded warmly by the great majority of the assembly; but for the sake of peace and with the hope of ending the unseemly business once and forever, it was agreed to send deputies to solicit the King's advice in the matter. Theodoric was reported by the messengers to have decided that the Pope ought to await the restitution of his property until the investigation of the

charges preferred against him would have first concluded. Obviously the criminal despoilers of church property were not in a position to bring forward accusations against anybody; nor was there any guarantee that, if their insidious efforts to compass the deposition of the Pope ended in failure, as they were doomed to end, such reckless miscreants could be made amenable to the authority of Council or Pope. This first session had been held in the Julian Basilica; but the second took place in the Jerusalem Basilica, after an interval of some weeks.

When the deputation that had been commissioned to obtain the King's decision on the principal point raised by the Pope had delivered their message some of the Antipope's partisans proposed that the assembly should now proceed to formulate their judgment, as the King had given the deputation this order in virtue of his conviction, duly and maturely arrived at in Rome, that Symmachus was guilty of the crimes imputed to him. This allegation was at once met with the objection that if the King had judicially investigated the case and found the Pontiff guilty, why did he entreat them to try to arrive at a decision without even suggesting that he himself had examined the charges at all, much less formed a clear and decisive judgment of the guilt of the accused? The falsity of this statement was too obvious to provoke any lengthened debate; but when that difficulty was removed another was raised. The factionists demanded that the Pope should deliver up his slaves, who, they alleged, were material witnesses in the most damaging of the incriminations. Both the canon and civil law prohibited the admission of the evidence of slaves unless they were subjected to torture—*assertio servilis innocenti examine non probanda*—and even then their testimony would not be sufficient to justify either acquittal or condemnation unless other reliable witnesses were forthcoming. There is no proof that the Pontiff himself refused to give up the slaves *to the Council*; everything points to his readiness to comply with any conditions exacted, however humiliating. But, as Ennodius argues, the oath of a slave without the application of torture was inadmissible in any court; to apply torture was against the spirit of the Church and so cruel a relic of barbarism that the bishops could not for a moment entertain the idea of resorting to it; the accusers must, therefore, see that this evidence is utterly excluded, and it is clear they are not *bona fide* in their unheard-of demand. It is hardly necessary to caution the reader against regarding the existence of *slaves* in the Papal household as anything extraordinary in those days; Christianity had lightened the yoke of slavery, but did not at once entirely abolish this ancient institution. The final extinction of slavery in the countries dominated by the spiritual sway of the

Latin Church was only effected by the famous edict of Pope Alexander III. in the twelfth century. We read of St. Symmachus in the *Liber Pontificalis*: "Episcopis Africanis exulibus pecuniam et vestes singulis annis mittebat; captivos per diversas provincias pecunia redemit, et dona multiplicavit et dimisit."

In the meantime, while these animated discussions were engaging the attention of the assembled bishops, the venerable Pontiff, bending under the terrible weight of humiliation and heart-bleeding grief for his poor flock, who were being scandalized and torn from their loving shepherd, set out from St. Peter's to confront his clamorous and conscienceless accusers. But it was not in vain that the blood of the two great apostles and of countless holy martyrs had consecrated and endeared the old city to the Sacred Heart of the Redeemer. If the Christian sentiment of Rome had not rebelled against the infernal savagery with which its revered Bishop and spiritual Father was being persecuted, "the very stones would rise in mutiny." Such scenes of wild indignation had not been witnessed in the city of Seven Hills since the soul-stirring and tragic event of Virginia, a thousand years before. Ladies of noblest birth contended with ragged beggar-women, proud senators with the pious plebeians, in their efforts to show their sympathy for their beloved Pontiff by crowding around him, and consoling him by their prayers and tears on his way to the hall, where the synod was being held. These manifestations of heartfelt love and piety maddened the hostile party, who were strangers to every feeling of religion or public decency; a hired mob assailed the sad and peaceful procession with indiscriminating fury, smiting everybody who came in their way, wounding hundreds of the defenseless multitude, and murdering numbers of persons, lay and cleric, without distinction and without mercy. The *Liber Pontificalis* presents a sickening picture of the outrages committed: "Caedes et homicidia in clero ex invidia fiebant. Qui vero communicabant beato Symmacho juste, publice qui inventi fuissent intra urbem gladio occidebantur. Etiam et sanctimoniales mulieres et virgines deponentes de monasteriis vel de habitaculis suis, denudantes sexum feminineum coedibus plagarum afflictas vulnerabant, et omni die pugnas contra ecclesiam in medio civitatis gerebant. Etiam multos sacerdotes occiderunt inter quos Dignissimum et Gordianum presbyteros et multos alios Christianos."

The malignant accusers, possessing no legal or trustworthy evidence and seeing the current of justice and sympathy irresistible, abandoned the Council and devoted themselves to the more congenial work of stimulating brutal assault and promiscuous violence. From the very opening of the assembly the sweeping majority of the

bishops had strenuously opposed the hearing of the charges at all, inasmuch as they were incompetent to deal with them judicially, the Holy See being entirely above their jurisdiction. Common prudence, however, and the good of the Church demanded that they should comply with the wishes of the King as far as was consistent with the canons; and since he had so urgently impressed upon them to settle the matter definitely before they would break up they remained in the city and forwarded to him an exhaustive report of the sessions they had held and of the tumultuous sequel to their deliberations. Naturally enough Symmachus declined to leave the precincts of his palace again, as his life would be exposed to extreme peril, and all who would venture to show sympathy or to extend protection would incur similar risk. On the previous occasion three officers of the King had sworn to protect him, and, faithful to their oaths, they succeeded in rescuing himself, but could make no attempt to defend his helpless followers. Theodoric's reply to the message of the prelates requesting him to relieve them from their perplexity is a most marvelous document from whatever standpoint we may view it. Having premised that if he had considered this trial a matter in which he could interfere, he felt quite convinced that himself and his chief magistrates could have judicially examined all the bearings of the case and have long since arrived at an impartial and just decision; he adds: "It is a matter entirely resting with you under God's guidance, and if you regard it as wrong to take cognisance of the charges, then adopt some other means of quelling sedition and riot" — "*Qualiter vultis ordinate, sive discussa sive indiscussa causa, proferte sententiam, de qua estis rationem divino iudicio reddituri.*" The unconscious testimony of secular princes and of men of transcendent genius, even outside the pale of her communion, to the divine commission of the Church, has been both frequent and striking, but we question whether a more remarkable instance of it is recorded than that which the conduct and correspondence of the enlightened Arian Theodoric furnished during this controversy.

The bishops reassemble on the 6th of November and decide that *in the eyes of men* Pope Symmachus is free from crime and stain; but that the question of his culpability or innocence in the sight of heaven must be reserved to God, who alone has jurisdiction to judge the Vicar of Christ. They pronounced him "free from every alleged incrimination and outside the reach of legal pursuit in all things that regarded men, reëstablished in full jurisdiction over all churches dependent on the Holy See and entitled to all the ecclesiastical rights of Sovereign Pontiff within and without the city of Rome. Let no Christian, therefore, in those churches hesitate to communicate with him or to receive Holy Communion at his hands" — "*Totam causam*

Dei judicio reservantes, universos hortamur, ut sacram communionem (sicut respostulat) ab eo percipiant."

Just at the moment when the Church seemed almost strangled by sedition her voice rings out clearly, to be carried down through the centuries on the winds of time, her unchanging and infallible accents. It was a decree of colossal importance, at once solidifying and entrenching the Papal supremacy, while it thrust back in confusion and impotence the powers of hell that had charged with such desperate ferocity. *Digitus Dei est hic*; undoubtedly, but humanly viewed the brunt of the fight was borne cheerfully and well by the material resources, the tact, the ability and the Christian fortitude of Ennodius, powerfully supported by the Senator Faustus. The faithful and illustrious Bishop of Milan, the warm friend and zealous fellow-worker of Ennodius in this holy cause, is the first to append his name, and the form of his subscription excludes the possibility of doubt as to the meaning of the decision: "Ego, Laurentius, Episcopus ecclesiae Mediolanensis, subscripsi huic sententiae a nobis latae quâ tota causa judicio Dei relata est." Pardon is extended to the bishops and clergy who had taken part in this disgraceful campaign of calumny and violence, on condition of their immediate return to the bosom of the Church and the renunciation of the calamitous career they had been following. The Senate had already decreed to follow the sage and inspired example of non-interference so admirably set them by the King. And now everything appeared settled and tranquillity once more returned to the streets and churches of the sacred city; but the calm was only on the surface. There were still raging ugly undercurrents of discontent, and murmurs of indignation at the alleged miscarriage of justice were sedulously propagated by a contemptible and rapidly dwindling clique. These secret whisperings soon found expression in a cleverly written, insidious pamphlet entitled "*Adversus Synodum Absolutionis Incongruae*," which Ennodius rightly designates an "*opus foetidum*."

One hundred and fifteen bishops had attended the first session of this famous Council, but many of them had retired to their respective sees during the riots and lengthened interruptions. Sixty-seven names are appended to the decrees. The heads of the Church in Gaul had in the meantime learned that their brother prelates in Italy had assembled to judge the recognized Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, and being unaware that the proceedings were initiated by the Pope himself, they were astounded beyond measure that anybody had dared to sit in judgment on the highest earthly judge. When the decree of acquittal was received by them they assembled in council under the presidency of Saint Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, grandson of the Emperor Avitus and an illustrious

Roman Senator as well as a cultured and zealous ecclesiastic. They addressed a memorable letter to the chief men among the Senate: "When we perused the decree bearing on the subject of the Pontiff we were seized with the deepest alarm, being persuaded, as we are still, that the whole episcopal fabric is shaken when its foundation and source of strength is attacked. We cannot conceive what law there is that could confer on inferiors the right to judge their superior. If anything is considered irregular or unlawful in the conduct of other prelates, there is their common Head, the Roman Pontiff, to pronounce judgment and to demand reformation; but when the authority of the Roman Pontiff himself is impugned, then it is not an individual bishop, but the whole episcopacy that is placed in peril. When the sailors meet and attack the captain of the ship, is it right to encourage the mutineers? That supreme shepherd who is at the head of the flock of our Lord must render an account of his conduct, but it is the Sovereign Judge, and not the flock, that can exact from him that account. We find some consolation in the fact that the assembled prelates have referred the judgment to Almighty God and have attested before the world that neither they nor King Theodoric have discovered any evidence in support of the accusations preferred." This unmistakable and emphatic assertion of the traditional teaching of the Church on the question of the Papal supremacy is not merely the expression of the deep-rooted belief of the Bishops of Gaul; it is, furthermore, a strong and a bright link in the golden chain of unity in faith and in allegiance that then as now bound the Catholic churches of all nations to the Holy See, "the mother and the mistress of all the churches."

The *Liber Pontificalis* informs us that one happy result of the groundless arraignment and honorable acquittal was to restore thoroughly the high prestige of the Roman Pontiff and to enhance his personal reputation and popularity. But the work was incomplete as long as the foul breath of calumny was allowed to taint the atmosphere. Falsehoods and base insinuations were the last ramparts of the ignoble vanquished, and even these had to be demolished. Hitherto the organizer of victory kept in the rearguard of the fight; now it was necessary that he should be placed in the very forefront. A fourth council was convened, and it is generally affirmed by historians that the prelates who had come from very distant parts remained in the Holy City by desire of the Pope during the interval of close on twelve months between the issue of their historic judgment and this fourth council. This hypothesis is grounded on the identity of names and the slowness and other difficulties attending locomotion in those days; and its probability is much increased when we consider the constant signs manifested of a recrudescence of the

sedition and scandal. The assembly now convened for the autumn of 502 is known in history as the "Synodus Palmaris," from the name of the hall where the bishops met in deliberation. The opening address of the Roman Pontiff, who of course presided, confirms the opinion of Baronius, who regards this synod merely as a continuation or the concluding sessions of the third council. "*This venerable assembly,*" says His Holiness, "faithful to the observance of the ecclesiastical laws and with a becoming fear of the wrath of God, has rightly decreed everything it was their duty or privilege to determine, and thereby discharged the debt of justice with scrupulous exactitude. Your decision has provided for all contingencies; there is nothing to be added to it, more particularly as regards those ecclesiastics whose ambition for power has broken the yoke of canonical discipline."

It has been already stated that one of the indictments brought against Pope Symmachus was the alleged reckless expenditure of public funds of which he was merely the administrator and not the proprietor. The manuscript of Verona gives great prominence to this charge; hence it is manifest that his accusers made the most effective use of it that facts and a wilfully wrong interpretation of what was meant by Canon Law of binding force enabled them to make. To the charge of scandalous conduct Symmachus had already given an answer more weighty and crushing than any defense in words. He had induced the bishops to enact that every ecclesiastic bound by a vow of chastity should have always near him, day and night, a *syncellanus*, who could testify to the purity of his life if exigencies required. Even Ennodius expends on this point very little of his impassioned eloquence; he quotes Cicero for the self-evident dictum that accusation is one thing, but calumny quite another; adduces some telling citations from Scripture, and then justly upbraids the maligners with the total absence of proof. But being now reinstated in power and restored to liberty of action and of speech, the Pontiff himself brings before the synod the alleged mismanagement of Church funds and secures important legislation on the subject. Here, again, we have the plainest evidence of the intimate connection between the two councils; what is introduced as an impeachment before the first assembly is fully answered and the matter legislated upon in the second. In language of just indignation His Holiness exclaims in his introductory address: "In omnes, quos in me vanus furor excitavit, agnoscant me nihil magis studere, quam ut saluum esse possit quod mihi est a Deo sub dispensatione commissum."

The particular statute which the Pontiff was charged with infringing was designated the Law of Odoacer, from the circumstances

in which it was sought to have it imposed upon the Church in the name of that monarch. Six days after the death of Pope Simplicius, in 483, the clergy, Senate and people assembled in St. Peter's to elect a successor, according to the custom that then prevailed. Before the proceedings had concluded the patrician Basilius presented himself in presence of the assembly as the accredited representative of the King, Odoacer. Having first complained that the election should not have been undertaken without the sanction of the King, he proclaimed aloud there and then the enactment in question, having neither asked nor obtained the concurrence or fiat of any ecclesiastical authority. It ran thus: "That the Pontiff about to be elected and his successors forever are hereby forbidden to alienate to any other purpose or to the use of any other building than those named by the donor, any possessions or goods, immovable or movable, that have been presented to or acquired by the Church, whether in the city or outside its walls. Any sale or conveyance in contravention of this law shall be null and void, and the person attempting such conveyance shall by that very act incur anathema. A similar penalty and censure shall be entailed by the purchaser as well as by his heirs in actual possession of the property, whether immediate or mediate, and so forth."

In the Acts of the Council we find a clear and exhaustive statement of the position in which the Roman Pontiff stood in reference to this pronouncement of a purely secular authority. "Suppose the priests of a diocese apart from their bishop or the bishops of a province in defiance of their metropolitan were to assemble and to attempt to pass a law that would be binding on the said bishop or said metropolitan, would such pretended legislation have the binding force of a statute? And if not, with how much greater reason must we regard as utterly null and void the so-called laws that secular authorities, laics, have presumed to dictate to the Apostolic See? There was even at the time no existing Roman Pontiff who alone in virtue of the supremacy derived from St. Peter could give force and sanction to such a statute. Such decrees can in no sense be reckoned among the number of canonical laws." The "law of Odoacer" was, therefore, declared uncanonical and nugatory, but a synodal statute was now passed embodying many of its provisions. Thus was Symmachus exonerated and the domains and other property of the Church at the same time protected against destruction or alienation. Nothing further remained to be transacted by this Council except the question of dealing with the vile and dangerous pamphlet that assailed so insidiously the legality and motives of the Synodus Palmaris. A commission is formally given to Ennodius in the name and by the authority of the Council to embody the views

of the assembly and the arguments supplied by the Canon Law, with which he was known to be so intimately conversant, in an orderly and exhaustive reply to all the enemy's statements of law and fact. Some writers are of opinion that this order was issued by the fifth Council; that Ennodius happened to be at Rome, as indeed we may fairly assume, and that a few days sufficed to enable this brilliant and ready expert in pleading to prepare his famous "Apologia." It matters little from which assembly he received the command; both possessed the same supreme authority under the presidency of the Pope, and even in personnel there is not any notable difference. The opening address supplies the date, "after the consulship of Avienus," or 503, and proceeds to announce the object for which the synod was convened, namely, to hear the "Apologia" composed by Ennodius read by that eminent ecclesiastic and to approve of it as embodying the principles of true doctrine and right discipline. We have already given numerous quotations from this wonderful document as the subject-matter appeared to demand, and hence we shall here confine our attention to a few points that seem to need further elucidation.

Mere allegations of fact do not touch the question of Papal supremacy at all save in a remote or accidental manner, and it is with this aspect of the case that we are mainly concerned. On comparing the acts of the various Councils with the "Apologia" we cannot fail to be struck with the remarkable agreement of the tone and general aim of the assembled bishops and of the "Apologist." Was it merely by chance, for instance, or with a view to assert the said supremacy of the Apostolic See that such a marked divergence of form was observed by Symmachus, the Roman Pontiff, and by Laurence of Milan and the rest of the prelates in the signatures of the acts of the fourth Council? "I, Coelius Symmachus, Bishop of the Church of Rome, have signed this constitution *made by Us*," and "I, Coelius Laurence, Bishop of the Holy Church of Milan, have signed this constitution *made by the venerable Pope Symmachus*."

Every argument and every specious allegation that ingenuity could suggest were resorted to in order to weaken the deadly effect on the schismatics of the crushing judgment of the "Synodus Palmaris," or as they indignantly designated it, the "Synodus Absolutionis Incongruae." The first and most obvious of their objections has been already solved by anticipation, where it was explained that many of the bishops attending the early sessions of the third Council had been taken themselves to their respective homes before the proceedings, retarded by long interruptions, had reached the happy termination so ardently wished for. But the pamphlet suggests that there were many prelates in Rome who absented themselves from

the final session and in no way endorsed the judgment impugned. Though Ennodius had warned his illustrious audience, in his exordium, that all ornaments of style were to be carefully avoided in his effort to present unvarnished narrative and plain arguments, yet he here dashes forth into the sublimest flights of oratory. "No doubt there were some black sheep in the flock; they hid themselves in the obscurity that became them; they had loved to plot and plan and intrigue in secret. Will they feel grateful to their friends for dragging them into the light?" Naturally enough, when the factionists found themselves in such a wretched minority, and saw no prospect of being able even to create a riot of respectable dimensions, owing to the presence of three high military functionaries of Theodoric at the synod, they discreetly withdrew.

Here it may not be out of place to remark that it would be at once unjust and untrue to represent *all* the opponents of Pope Symmachus as utterly devoid of personal sanctity. On occasions of the kind there are invariably some unfortunate dupes that allow themselves to be swayed by private predilections or to be misled by false appearances. Conspicuous as an example of that class was the exemplary and saintly Paschasius, of whom Saint Gregory narrates that although he had done great penance and died a holy death, he was detained in Purgatory for a considerable time on account solely of the part he took in the schism, though his error was not fully deliberate or malicious. Thirty Masses had been ordered by St. Gregory to be celebrated for his soul on so many consecutive days, and at the conclusion of that time, though Gregory had quite forgotten the instructions he had given, Paschasius appeared to a companion to return thanks for the Masses and to say that it was the efficacy of the Holy Sacrifice so constantly offered that had satisfied even then for his already forgiven crime against the Holy See.

There is one portion of the "Apologia" that appears at first sight overweighted with hyperbole, but on closer examination it becomes manifest that the strict limits of fact and logical reasoning are fairly well observed. Even friendly critics sometimes admit that the language is somewhat too strong, but plead that the exaggeration is at once natural and pardonable. No doubt isolated sentences smack of exaggeration, but viewed in the context the statements and deductions are truthful and legitimate. The writers who have sought to place the Papal authority on a level inferior to that of an Œcumenical Council labor this point with disgusting excess and subtlety. They affirm roundly that the doctrine conveyed by Ennodius may be enunciated in these terms: Every successor of St. Peter is either already impeccable or his elevation to the Papacy renders him so; and they base the sweeping inference they wish to be deduced from

this false proposition on the well-worn axiom of philosophy, "*Qui nimis probat, nil probat.*" Take, for instance, the following passage, and see whether it supposes the Roman Pontiff incapable of sinning: "I have searched carefully and probed to the very bottom the alleged irregularities of Symmachus. I am not the man to wish that this See, on which so many distinguished Popes have shed the lustre of their learning and sanctity, should now be dishonored; fear not that I have failed to make the most exhaustive investigation. If Pope Symmachus is guilty, believe me, the judgment of God will fall heavy upon him at the close of his brief and troubled career. In the balance of that all-seeing and all-just Judge the scale of chastisement or the scale of reward will incline by the infallible test of merit."

It is perfectly needless to multiply quotations. These few sentences abundantly show that Ennodius neither believed nor asserted that the Pope is impeccable. To be exalted above the jurisdiction of earthly tribunals is one thing, as Ennodius well knew, and to be raised above human frailty and the liability to sin is quite another. But the orator very justly observes that such instances of vicious habits or of gross crimes on the part of the Roman Pontiffs have been neither so frequent nor so glaring as to break notably the continuity of strong virtue as well as faith transmitted from St. Peter untarnished through the long line of his unimpeachable successors. This immunity of the Holy See from grave blemishes, as a general rule, is the result of two causes principally. First, the extreme care and numerous precautions employed in the selection of a suitable man to elevate to that highest of all dignities in this world is in itself an important guarantee that his future life will be as edifying at least as his past career is known to have been. Again, the weighty responsibility and the ever-present consciousness of what is expected from him, even humanly speaking, steady the wavering efforts of nature and strengthen the healthy influence of self-respect. Lastly but chiefly, the supernatural aids merited by personal holiness and good works or obtained through the intercession and sufferings of the first Pope, St. Peter, who cannot cease to watch over the spotlessness of the tiara, and of the many illustrious Pontiffs, saints and martyrs whose powerful prayers are unceasingly offered before the throne of God for the latest successor in their imperishable dynasty.

"Saint Peter, of glorious memory, has transmitted to his successors an undying heritage of merits as well as of sanctity. What he himself gained by the abundant and lustrous excellence of his works is communicated to them, in some measure, as associated with him in the same dignity. For who can doubt the holiness of that bishop who has the grace of holiness supplied to him in abundance by the

example and merits of his predecessors, even though he had not been himself remarkable in the past for personal sanctity in any extraordinary degree? In a word, either St. Peter raises to that honor such persons only as are illuminated with the grace of God, or he procures for them that illuminating grace at their elevation; for he is singularly in a position to appreciate what is needful for the foundation on which the fabric of the Universal Church is to be supported."

This passage presents the head and front of his offending, and yet when viewed in conjunction with and in the light of the entire context, no impartial reader will detect in it such undue exaggeration as can detract in the slightest from his estimation of the cogent reasoning and excellent discernment of the orator. The various forms of support that combine to secure the successor of Peter against the assaults of Satan and a wicked world are enumerated, and among them the special protection and intercession of the first great Vicar of Christ; but the infallibility of the Pope in his teaching capacity rests on the divine promises alone: "Thou art Peter (Rock), and upon *this* Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." "I have asked on thy behalf that thy faith fail not, and do thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." The infallibility of the Church is a different element of unfailing immunity from error vested in the corporate body as well as in the head, and indicated in the texts: "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world;" "He that hears you hears me," and so forth. Whereas impeccability, either in regard to personal righteousness or official freedom from faults other than doctrinal, is nowhere promised in the Sacred Writings, and has never been claimed by either the Prince of the Apostles or any of his successors. Unfortunately, history proves but too conclusively that an unworthy aspirant may succeed in reaching that sublime dignity and that his elevation does not necessarily change him into an angel. The same Divine Redeemer who permitted an unworthy follower to be enrolled and to remain to the end in the sacred community of the Apostles has permitted also, for the same inscrutable motives, an ambitious or simoniacal ecclesiastic to fill the chair of Peter, from time to time, but the infallibility ever emerges unsmirched from such searching tests.

"But," demanded the adversaries of Symmachus, "if the Roman Pontiff and the majority of the bishops, as you maintain, believed consistently from the beginning that no earthly power can sit in judgment on the Pope, why did they allow the Council to be convened for that express purpose? And, secondly, if the Council thus assembled were right in their much applauded decision that they had

absolutely no jurisdiction in the case—*qualitas negotii transit audituros*—then surely their acquittal of the accused cannot claim any value or respect.” It is on this last point of alleged inconsistency that the title of the pamphlet is based, “*Adversus Synodum Absolutionis Incongruae*.”

In reply to the first objection here advanced, Ennodius quotes a decree of the Council of Carthage, which prescribes special procedure in regard to accusations that emanate from individuals belonging to the household of the person arraigned. Obviously private hatred, wounded pride, disappointed ambition, grasping avarice or some such malignant motive may naturally be suspected to have prompted such incriminations. Now, if the bishops remained away each in his own cathedral town, they could take no collective action or make no proper inquiry into the origin of these charges, and would necessarily run the risk of allowing an innocent man to suffer, a fair reputation to be blighted and the Head of the Church to be unjustly and cruelly calumniated, to the ineffable scandal of all the faithful. Besides, the King repeatedly points out in his letters what was also in the minds of the assembled prelates the dominant reason why they were called to Rome and detained there until they would arrive at a final decision; namely, to restore tranquillity to Church and State, *causa discussa aut indiscussa*.

The obvious answer to the second point of inconsistency alleged is that even a “court of first instance,” that possesses no jurisdiction to mark punishment, can undoubtedly declare that the case against the accused is unsustainable and, as the English jurists express it, find “no bill,” that is, declare there is no *primâ facie* credible evidence of guilt. Before a criminal charge is submitted to a Judge of Assize the heads of the available testimony in support of it are examined by the “grand jury,” and by finding a “true bill” or “no bill” they send the case for trial or scout it out of court. The Scottish legal phrase “not proven” expresses still more precisely the meaning of the sentence pronounced in favor of Symmachus.

But supposing the evidence had been both abundant and convincing against Pope Symmachus, what course remained open to the bishops while discharging their conscientious duty on the one hand and respecting the Papal supremacy, as they were bound, on the other? Any reader acquainted with ecclesiastical history will recall the remarkable story of the condemnation of Pope Marcellinus, which rightly interprets the spirit of the Church and accurately conveys the traditional teaching from the earliest ages. It was during the persecution of Diocletian, and Marcellinus is said, by many writers mostly on the authority of Donatists, to have been frightened into an open act of apostasy by swinging a censer before an idol.

Three hundred bishops and thirty priests, it is stated, assembled at Sinnessa Pometia to hold an indignation meeting and to publicly dissociate themselves from such a scandalous betrayal of his high trust. The acts of this Council inform us that the unanimous decision of the assembly was expressed in these words, which the Pope was summoned and duly presented himself to hear: "Tu eris iudex; ex te enim damnaberis et ex te justificaberis, tamen in nostra praesentia." Marcellinus publicly confessed his scandalous abjuration of the faith and pronounced judgment upon himself according to the terrible penances prescribed in those days. Then the bishop who was to affix his signature first, Helciades, arose and declared in a solemn tone: "Iuste condemnatus est ore suo, et ore suo anathema in se suscepit; nemo enim unquam iudicavit Pontificem, quoniam prima Sedes non iudicabitur a quopiam."

The long-sustained plaudits accorded by the august assembly to the eloquent deacon of Milan were echoed throughout the wide expanse of Christendom; for the "Apologia" was stamped by the Pope and Council with the seal of approval and ordered to be incorporated with the official acts. This was an unprecedented honor; but it was not to enhance his own fame that he labored. Had he been ambitious, the dignities of the Church were at his acceptance, for his merit and qualifications were unquestionable. It was eight long years afterwards that he was prevailed upon to exchange the humble and laborious post of teacher and deacon for the higher and more responsible dignity of Bishop of Pavia. His life-long friend and enthusiastic admirer, Pope Hormisdas, employed him afterwards, on two different occasions, to execute a mission of supreme importance and of trying delicacy to the imperial court of Constantinople. The hardships and perils so heroically endured on the second trip shattered his constitution and contributed largely to his early and lamented death. His bones rest in his beloved Pavia, near those of the great Saint Augustine, after whose illustrious example he had patterned his life and works.

E. MAGUIRE.

Vienne, France.

PROTESTANT DOMINATION OVER WEAK COMMUNITIES.

AN HISTORICAL STUDY.

MANY public men throughout the United States assert that the subjugation of the people of the Philippine Islands will prove of great advantage to the Filipinos; that under American rule they will be taught a much higher grade of civilization than that which they now have, or that they could possibly have attained under Spanish authority, or that they could reach through any effort of their own unaided by outsiders.

Many American Protestant preachers in the press and from pulpit and platform assert with equal assurance that the subjugation of the Filipinos will mean for them a much higher type of Christianity than they now exhibit; that it will mean for them the Gospel truth as represented by the multifarious Protestant sects, and hence that they will be morally benefited by the establishment of American authority over them. The assurance of politician and preacher is quite flattering to our national vanity and it appeals with force to pious Protestant souls who still cling with desperate fidelity to the Bible despite the "higher criticism" and the wholesale disintegration of the Protestant sects into Rationalism.

Without questioning in the least the perfect sincerity and good faith of politician or preacher respecting the temporal and the eternal welfare of the Philippine Islander, this question must arise in the mind of every simple American: "What reasonable ground have we before us which tends to support the flattering assertions of politician and preacher?" This we know: We have had considerable experience already in our history in this matter of dealing with so-called inferior races, that is to say, with people not of the Caucasian race. For nearly three hundred years we have been engaged in civilizing and Christianizing the red man. And what is the result of our efforts with him? It is this: within the extent of our dominion the red man is almost extinct. In a brief space of time the last representative of that race will have escaped our control by death.

Our experience with the black man extends over an almost equal period of years. And how do we find the black man as he exists in our midst to-day? He is looked down upon generally as an inferior being, as one created inferior in the order of Nature; the taint of African blood in his veins, however scant it may be, is regarded as a stigma and mark of inferiority. He is trampled upon from time to

time, his person is insecure, he is subject to the animosity of individuals or lawless mobs without adequate redress under the laws. Special laws are passed by white men who call themselves Christians to emphasize the distinction between the races, and these laws are passed with the assent and approval of Godly Protestant preachers. In a word, the story of our relations with the red man has been a tragic one, now practically ended. We are yet in the middle of the chapter with the black race, with a most gloomy outlook ahead.

Yet in the face of these facts, notwithstanding those lurid chapters of our history which should bring the blush of shame to every Christian brow, we are strenuously invited, nay, we are appealed to, in the name of Christianity, to try our civilizing influences on the brown man, seven thousand miles from the territory in which we have all but exterminated the red man.

That we have failed disastrously respecting the red is a conclusive historical fact, and that we are doomed to failure with the black is almost indubitable unless some new element enters into our mode of action. But why have we failed? Our intentions were doubtless good towards both races, and yet absolute failure has been the result of our efforts. The answer to this question opens up a larger one which essentially includes it. It may be stated in the simplest terms in this form:

1. No Protestant nations or Protestant missionaries have ever yet converted to Christianity or civilized a pagan nation or community.
2. The domination of a Protestant nation over every so-called inferior race has resulted either in the extermination of the latter or in its absolute subordination to the Protestant conqueror, who has exploited the people for the material benefit of the rulers.
3. Catholic nations and Catholic missionaries alone have been successful in converting and civilizing pagan communities.

These statements are simply questions of fact supported by abundant testimony from the pages of history. Before entering upon a brief consideration of them let us first clear the air of false concepts respecting inferior races. It is quite certain that the idea of an inferior race is not a Catholic idea. It is essentially a pagan concept and has been adopted by Protestantism, as exemplified by Protestant nations in their dealings with weak peoples.

"Of one blood God hath made all mankind." "Go, teach all nations," was the command of the Master to His disciples. "There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all in all." These and other injunctions of the Master express the Catholic concept of the brotherhood of the race in full essence and vigor. That there are

weak races and communities, just as we find weak individuals, deficient it may be in coherence or cunning or physical strength or arms of precision for destroying human life, is quite true. But they may not be inferior, therefore, in all that constitutes true greatness. We know that the Spotless One was offered an extensive territory, provided He bowed down and worshiped the Evil One, and that He refused, and we know the sequel; the motley mob who looked for a Messiah of worldly power crying out, "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" and then the awful consummation on Calvary.

Weak nations or communities, be they civilized or uncivilized, are regarded quite generally as possessing no rights that the so-called world powers are bound to respect. Power and right are regarded generally as convertible terms by diplomatists and politicians who represent the world spirit. Indeed, of late it would seem that some American Catholics are seriously affected in this respect by the semi-pagan environment which surrounds them. Colonel Denby, ex-Minister to China, who, it is alleged, is a Catholic, is a notable instance of this, as evidenced by various articles from his pen that have been published from time to time during the past two years in various publications, in which he advocates not only the subjugation of the Filipinos, but suggests that the United States should grab a portion of the Chinese Empire in the interest of civilization.

We find also an excellent priest of the Dominican order in a book which he has written about the Filipinos characterizing them as an inferior race and referring to the black people of Hayti and Santo Domingo in the same way. This, to say the least, is rather a singular attitude for a priest of the order of Saint Dominic to take. Just here a word respecting these Filipino Christians. The writer of this article in a lengthy conversation on the subject with an American priest who had spent several months on the Island of Luzon asked him this question: "From your observation of the Filipinos whom you met, how will they compare—say the 2,000,000 people of Luzon with the 2,000,000 people of the city of Chicago?" His answer was substantially that as well as he could judge the Luzon Christians in the observance of the moral law and the practice of the domestic virtues would compare more than favorably with the population of Chicago. They do not possess such enormous buildings nor such evidences of material wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but neither do they present such evidences of abject poverty and moral degradation. He said further that the Filipino Christian could with much truth say to the American, as Athenagoras of Athens, one of the early Christian apologists, said to the pagan philosophers: "Among us will be found the ignorant, the poor, laborers and old women who cannot, perhaps, define by reasoning the truth of their

doctrine. They do not enter into discussion, but they do good works. The most aged they honor as their fathers and mothers. The hope of another life makes them despise the present, even in the midst of lawful pleasures. Marriage with them is a holy vocation, which imparts the grace necessary to bring up their children in the fear of the Lord."

With this clearing of the atmosphere respecting the phrase "inferior races," let us now proceed to the consideration of the first point, namely: "No Protestant nations or Protestant missionaries have ever yet converted to Christianity or civilized a pagan nation or community."

Let us take first the case of England's dealings with pagan communities, because that nation is recognized as the leading Protestant one of the world and the source heretofore of the greatest volume of Protestant missionary effort. And first as to its dealing with India, an extensive territory containing a population of nearly 300,000,000 of people under British control. England became the paramount power in that territory in 1757 as a consequence of Lord Clive's signal victory over the Mogul power. After the victory the British officials established a system of government which has been described by many eminent authorities as forming one of the most revolting and horrible chapters to be found on the page of history. The natives were robbed, imprisoned and murdered by the British governing classes without remorse or mercy. Those were the days of Vansittart and Hastings. Edmund Burke declared in the British House of Commons that "were we to be driven out of India this day nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any better than the ourang-outang or the tiger."

From that day to this the rule of Britain in India has been marked by pestilence, periodical famine and rebellion. Wholesale famine sweeps off the natives by the million every few years, while they are compelled to support an enormous native army paid to hold them in subjection, as well as a European army, and also to pay enormous salaries to a host of British officials. The country is dominated primarily with a view to British interests, and it is squeezed as a lemon is squeezed to subserve those interests solely. The Hindoo has no voice in the making of the laws which he must obey or of saying anything about how he shall be taxed; the British officials make the laws, levy the taxes and collect them. The Indian Government permits the Hindoo to worship his idols in peace as long as he pays his taxes; the Juggernaut worship, involving the sacrifice of human lives, was permitted as long as the taxes were promptly paid. If the latter were not paid he must go to jail. While Britain's

government in the eighteenth century and well on into the nineteenth was forcing Protestantism upon Irish and British Catholics, it was studiously liberal towards the followers of Mahommed and Buddha and the other religious sects of India.

The first British officials with their numerous European followers in India seem to have paid very little regard to the observances of their own religion, if they can be said to have had any. A well-known English writer and minister of the Established Church, Dr. Close, the dean of Carlisle, in his work written in 1858, informs us that "more than half a century elapsed from the first appearance of the British in India before they thought of erecting a church for themselves." And Dr. Close makes the somewhat startling assertion regarding the attitude of the British rulers in that great dependency towards Christianity that "of the government of India it may be truly affirmed and fully established by circumstantial evidence that its whole weight, influence and authority has been directed against the progress of Christianity among the heathen." And he adduces abundant testimony in his book to prove that assertion. He shows that American Protestant missionaries in 1812 were driven out from Calcutta to Bombay, where they were imprisoned, and that when they escaped in a coasting vessel they were pursued, retaken and confined to the fort. And that as late as 1813 not a single missionary would be permitted to go to India in a British ship, and that it had become a definite rule of the British to permit no attempt to convert the natives and that that rule was rigidly maintained as long as possible. Not only maintained, but a law was made in 1814 by the governing authority, by virtue of which native Christians were excluded from holding any office of responsibility under the British. A host of witnesses, Protestant and Catholic, bear testimony to the anti-Christian attitude of British rule which was maintained exclusively to subserve the material welfare, first of the East India Company and its retainers, and afterwards of the British people themselves.

Referring to the personal example shown by the British garrison and officials to the Hindoos, Dr. Wolff, in the narrative of his travels there, informs us that "a well-known Protestant missionary called upon the celebrated Hindoo potentate, Runjeet Singh, at his palace in Lahore about half a century ago to have a conversation about religious and political matters, and in the course of the conversation the Hindoo Prince said to the missionary: 'You say you travel about for the sake of religion; why, then, do you not preach to the English in Hindostan, who have no religion at all?' And when the missionary related that conversation to Lord William Bentinck, the British Governor General, the latter observed: 'This is, alas! the

opinion of all the natives over India.' " The evil example of the whole British establishment in India is testified to by a multitude of unimpeachable witnesses.

From this it may be readily seen that the leading Protestant nation of the world not only did not convert or try to convert to Christianity any portion of the vast population of that great Indian Empire, but that it potentially threw serious obstacles in the way of their conversion even by Protestant missionaries, some of whom were undoubtedly very zealous and sincere men. Yet the British sovereign on being crowned takes a solemn oath to maintain "The laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel and the Protestant religion as it is established by law."

Now let us glance briefly at the operations of the Protestant missionaries in that country. Dutch and German Protestant clergymen were first on the ground, having entered by the way of the Dutch trading settlements. The harvest that followed their labors, according to their own showing, amounted to practically nothing. Toward the close of the eighteenth century the English Church, through its "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," employed some German and Danish Lutheran ministers to introduce Protestantism among the natives. A most singular selection truly this was, inasmuch as the English Church regarded the tenets of Lutheranism as downright heresy and Lutheran ministers as mere laymen who were engaged in the propagation of heretical views. But the clergymen of the Established Church could not be induced to volunteer for Christ's service in that torrid and deadly climate, and hence the zealous Lutherans were commissioned to disseminate doctrines that the English Church reprobated. A Protestant author who traveled extensively in India, Mr. Kaye, in his work, "Christianity in India," referring to the situation at the close of the eighteenth century, informs us that there was urgent need for earnest work there, because "up to that time Protestant efforts had resulted in small progress in the country." He adds that "some conversions had been made, but, alas! some of these were entirely in the wrong direction," a statement which he explains by pointing out that some of the English residents—Protestants, of course—had embraced Mahommedanism, while others, including the son of Sir Heneage Finch, had become Catholics. Strange spectacle. Those who became Catholics were virtually entering the Church in the catacombs in India at that time, because the Catholic Church was most rigorously proscribed by the Indian Government, which allowed perfect liberty to the Mahommedan and Brahmin worships. Even the very soldiers in the ranks of the army must be non-Catholics. No Catholics could be admitted to serve even as privates—as food for powder. In 1769 a resolution offered in the British Par-

liament to give authority to the East India Company to enlist Catholic recruits for service in India was defeated by an overwhelming majority. And at the same time no Catholics were eligible for admission into the British regular army.

Yet we perceive the marvelous fact that the Gospel of the Crucified One which had been preached by Saint Francis Xavier and his companions two hundred and fifty years before had not only taken root in that country, but that it had gained adherents within the shadow of British proscription and dire peril. How perilous it was to receive converts by the proscribed Catholic clergymen who attended the Indian missions at that time is referred to in his book by the Rev. Mr. Anderson, one of the Indian army chaplains, a Protestant, of course, who says that the government grew alarmed "at the progress of Romanism, and they resolved to enforce against its professors the penal statute, Twenty-third of Elizabeth, Chapter I.; and having discovered that one John da Gloria, a Portuguese priest, had baptized Matthew, son of Lieutenant Thorpe, deceased, they arrested him on a charge of high treason for procuring a person to be reconciled to the Pope."

Quite an inflow of Protestant missionaries from various countries poured into India towards the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Protestant zeal was then at its height; there was at that time a stalwart dogmatic Protestantism resting on the Bible, without question or doubt of its inspiration, animated by a burning desire to convert the heathen to membership in some one of the sects and thus save him from the errors of paganism if not the worse errors of Rome. Money was contributed without stint to pay liberal salaries and liberal expenses to male and female evangelizers. Bibles by the million were printed in the vernacular and distributed broadcast among the natives. Glowing reports were made by the evangelizers of that time of many conversions partly made and of several real conversions. It would appear from reading these reports that the sun of Christianity was arising in glory and splendor over the whole of Hindostan. The Church of England sent out its first bishop, a gentleman named Middleton, to administer affairs in its behalf. He arrived in 1814, accompanied by his wife and servants. As money was of little account compared with the salvation of souls, Bishop Middleton received for his spiritual exertions the modest sum of \$25,000 a year, and each of his two archdeacons received \$10,000 a year. When the bishop and his wife set out on his spiritual tours he was granted an additional liberal allowance for traveling expenses. All of which and many other interesting things concerning the bishop and his labors are told at considerable length by his biographer, a Protestant clergyman, Rev. C. W. Le Bas.

Mr. Le Bas says the bishop was much distressed at the condition in which he found things; that the native converts were few and they were divided, if not distracted, by the rival preachers of the Wesleyan, Presbyterian, Baptist, Lutheran, American Puritans and other sects. He further describes the effect of this rivalry upon the natives by saying: "Next to the suspicion that the Europeans are generally destitute of all real religion, the grand impediment the Gospel has to contend with among idolaters arises from the multiplicity of shapes under which our visible religion presents itself to their notice. Their observation uniformly is that they should think much better of Christianity if there were not quite so many different kinds of it."

From the time of Bishop Middleton to the present day money has been poured into the Protestant missionary field of India in great abundance, but it has disappeared as if thrown into a quicksand without leaving any substantial trace behind. Conversions have been reported by the missionaries, but independent observers, both Catholic and Protestant, agree in stating that no substantial gain has been made by them. British Government officials of high standing admit that to be the fact. Some Protestant missionaries themselves admit it. In times of famine some children have been secured by the missionaries and have been brought up as Protestants, but they generally relapse to their former worship or become atheists. Famine converts are very seldom reliable, as was exemplified by the failure of Protestant efforts to seduce the Irish from their ancient faith in the great famine of 1846-9. In a word, the past one hundred and fifty years of strenuous Protestant missionary effort in India has failed. Many writers assure us that the evangelizers have succeeded in unsettling the Hindoo's faith in his own religion, making of him an unbeliever and scoffer of all religions.

What has been said in reference to the Protestant propaganda in British India can also be stated of those portions of the country that came under the control of the Dutch and Danes. On the other hand, it may be remarked, and with significance, that the Gospel seed sown by Xavier and tended by his successors has found a lodgement in that arid soil and has struck root deeply, despite the enmity of the evil one exemplified by the persecutions to which Catholic missionaries, more especially the Jesuits, have been subjected, not only by the Dutch and British rulers, but by the Portuguese and French Governments when the latter were controlled by infidels.

A similar state of things obtains in Ceylon, Borneo and the Straits Settlements, where the Catholic missions hold the field under Protestant governments, and Protestant efforts at conversion have substantially failed.

Let us now glance at the work of England and Protestant missionaries in Australasia. The great continent of Australia up to about one hundred and fifty years ago was inhabited only by uncivilized aborigines, and so also were the large islands of New Zealand and Tasmania and other groups of islands off the coast. All these became subject to the rule of England, and Protestant missionaries for a long time had the field exclusively to themselves. Here certainly was virgin soil upon which to extend the blessings of Protestant civilization to an inferior race. The operation of the penal laws against Catholicism excluded Catholic effort. But what has been the result? Simply this: the natives have been slaughtered without remorse or compunction; they have been exterminated by the so-called superior race. One of the most tragic chapters of modern history is that written on Australasian soil in the blood of the native race. We are told by an English Protestant writer, Mr. George T. Loyd, who lived in that country thirty-three years, that when the first English settlers arrived in the great island of Tasmania the natives evinced the most friendly disposition towards them, but the native confidence was betrayed and they were slaughtered indiscriminately under the direction of the colonial authorities on one pretext or another. Military expeditions were fitted out to exterminate them *en masse*, as if they were wild beasts, and at length, about forty years ago, the last native of Tasmania had disappeared.

It took only the short period of twenty years to carry out the extermination of the natives of Tasmania. And such also has been substantially the fate of the whole native race on the Australian continent and in New Zealand. The black fellows of the continent and the heroic Maories of New Zealand have been wiped out without mercy or pity. There was no Las Casas on hand among the Protestant missionaries to denounce the murderous work of the civil rulers and their followers before England's Queen and Parliament. On the contrary, quite a number of the very missionaries who were there ostensibly to convert the natives to Protestantism were more interested in securing for themselves the lands of the native chiefs for nominal considerations. Instead of any effort on the part of these evangelizers to arouse the House of Commons to the bloody holocaust of the natives by the colonists, they were more interested in securing the spoils, as was succinctly shown by an investigation into their conduct by the House of Commons, which obliged quite a number of them to disgorge their ill-gotten wealth.

Under the domination of Britain and the evangelical work of the Protestant missionary the aboriginal race in that country is gone. But why? That is the question which forces itself upon the attention of every student of history in these days when our ears are as-

sailed and insulted by un-Catholic references of politician and preacher to superior and inferior races.

Let us now glance briefly, as we necessarily must within the limits of a magazine article, at the picture presented by China, which has not yet become subordinate to the so-called world powers, but seems likely in a short time to become so. The first substantial effort to introduce the Christian Gospel to the Chinese was put forth a little over three hundred years ago by the self-sacrificing fathers of the Company of Jesus. These spiritual athletes, unaccompanied by armed battalions and unsupported by warships, entered the Flowery Kingdom to win souls to Christ after the manner of the fishermen who were first commissioned. They were received with respect by the learned and high officials of the Chinese Empire and listened to with attention by the masses to whom they expounded the doctrine of the brotherhood of the whole human race. They prosecuted their mission with such remarkable success that it may be accurately estimated that at the end of the first hundred years of their labors there were about as many native converts in China as there are at the present hour, or in the neighborhood of about 1,000,000 souls. It would be a turning aside from the object in view to trace the history of Christian effort in that country and point out a probable reason—as it appears to the natural eye—why the effort has not been crowned with a greater measure of success. Suffice it to say here that since the commercial nations, these exemplars of Western civilization, have undertaken to force their manufactured products and other things upon the Chinese the latter have viewed with suspicion and distrust the aims and objects of the former, and unfortunately the religion which they professed as well.

And certainly the people of China had good reason to doubt the nobility of purpose and the morality of a Christian nation like England, who made war upon them to compel them to allow opium to be sold in their markets. So also they might doubt the morality of France when it seized the vast province of Tonkin and aided England in imposing the blessings of Western civilization by force upon them. Or the seizure of the province of Shantung by Germany a few years ago as an indemnity for the murder of some German Catholic missionaries, while at the same time certain orders of Catholic priests were declared by German law to be illegal societies. The whole course of the Western powers was not calculated to inspire the natives with a high regard for their code of public morality as exemplified by their policy of grab and spoliation.

In fact, the course pursued by the Christian nations in the East has thrown serious obstacles in the way of converting the pagans. Crooked diplomacy, quick-firing guns and armored ships of war

were not the weapons of the Crucified One. It is hardly an extravagant flight of the imagination to surmise that had the struggle in China between paganism and Christianity, which was substantially opened by the Jesuits at the close of the sixteenth century, continued upon the lines of the first hundred years, Christianity would be dominant in that vast territory to-day. But, alas! it was not so continued. The diabolical powers, reinforced by the cupidity and greed of professing Christians and their governments, have rendered the task of bringing those hundreds of millions of people with their ancient civilization under the banner of the Cross a work of extreme difficulty.

There is little doubt, however, that the influence of Protestantism represented by its missionaries has had a most deleterious influence against their conversion. It could not be otherwise in the nature of things. Presenting themselves before a civilized community like the Chinese, many of whom are highly educated men, professing an ancient religion, retaining many of the primary truths of the patriarchal days, and each missionary claiming to preach the Gospel of Christ, but each sectarian preaching a different version of that Gospel, is it to be wondered at that a strong presumption should arise in the mind of an intelligent or even an ignorant heathen against the divine origin of such a Gospel, about which its teachers themselves cannot agree? Then, also, in all the ancient religious systems of the East mortification of the flesh, penance and chastity are recognized as marks of exalted manhood, while Protestantism, through its missionaries, denies their efficacy and presents itself to the heathen mind as of the earth, earthy. While the sects have been doing a certain good work in the establishing of schools among the Chinese, as they have been doing in Hindostan and elsewhere, yet it is the general consensus of opinion among the great majority of independent onlookers that it has not succeeded in gaining any substantial foothold among the people. The Catholic missionary has achieved a measure of success in the face of great obstacles, as the missions scattered all over the country show. Protestant writers bear witness to the far-reaching influence of the latter. One of these, a well-known writer, Mr. Henry Norman, M. P., who has traveled extensively in China, recently says: "A distinction must be made between Catholic and Protestant missionaries. The former receive high recognition from natives and foreigners, and the result of their labors is more encouraging. They have established themselves in China, once for all, adopting the costume and attitude of mind of the people and managing to live on moderate resources; they are the living expression of those qualities which are thought both in the East and in the West attributes as essentials to the

priesthood: poverty, chastity and obedience. . . . Moreover, they are subject to a single authority, preach and practice one doctrine. I certainly need not explain that I am not prejudiced in favor of the Catholic propaganda; but I should be disloyal to both did I not acknowledge the deep respect which I feel both for the character and work of the many Catholic missionaries whom I met in China."

During the recent outbreak of the Boxers, which had its origin in deep-seated antipathy to foreigners and the religion which they profess, the Catholic priests, foreign or native born, stood by their flocks, ministering to them that their faith might not fail in the presence of death, while the Protestant shepherds, wherever the roads to the rear remained open, fled with their wives and families to a place of safety. Reports of the trials and persecutions and martyrdom of the Chinese Catholics remind one of the constancy and fidelity of the early Church in Rome, Corinth and Damascus. It seems quite probable that the partition of China among the physically strong powers of the world is close at hand. It may be expected that when that scheme of national plunder is consummated the spoliation of the inhabitants by the new rulers will begin. The population of China, like that of India, is too dense to be wiped out. Fiscal policies, exclusive commercial control will accomplish the purpose of the conquerors.

In Africa, as in Australasia, in the islands of the Pacific, as on the North American Continent, wherever Protestant authority has become predominant, the uncivilized heathen has already been exterminated or is rapidly undergoing that process. Such is the simple fact illustrated on every hand by the history of Protestant contact with every such community. Protestantism in its effect upon them has been as a devastating pestilence. On the other hand, where Catholic nations have controlled the uncivilized heathen the reverse has invariably been the case. In the Philippines, in the Gambier and Ladrone Islands, in the Catholic settlements dominating African tribes, as well as on the great continent of South America, the native peoples have been steadily advancing in civilization as well as materially increasing in population. This statement is amply supported by indisputable testimony, so that it may be taken as an invariable law of Catholic domination over such communities.

The limits of this article are necessarily too brief to permit our entering into details respecting the testimony on every hand. Let us take as an instance one of the new possessions added to the United States—the Hawaiian Islands. Protestantism for many years, since 1820, held undisputed sway there. The natives were active, robust, docile, teachable, and they welcomed the first Protestant mission-

aries who came among them with open arms. It was not until several years later that Catholic missionaries were suffered to work among them, the first Catholic priests who attempted to do so being forcibly expelled. The teachings of the various sects were expounded in those islands with perfect freedom, but the results seem to have had as fatal an effect as the angel of death over the host of Sennacherib. It was as if the plague had secured a permanent lodgement upon the islands. Continuously and rapidly the people have been dying out. Rev. Gustavus Hines, one of the American Protestant missionaries, writing in 1851 of the frightful loss of life among the natives, says: "The astonishing rapidity of the decrease of the Hawaiian population is perhaps without a parallel in the history of nations. . . . In the course of four successive years it diminished by 21,730." It may be observed that that frightful decline has continued to the present hour, so that only a small remnant of the native race is now left.

It is, however, here upon the American hemisphere that we can view most clearly the contrast afforded by the Protestant and Catholic contacts with partially or wholly uncivilized communities. After French authority was ousted on the North American continent about the middle of the eighteenth century, the vast majority of the North American continent became subject to Protestant England, while upon the South American continent Spain and Portugal, both Catholic countries, were the dominant powers. Let us take a snap-shot glance at the story as told in history. First as to North America. The pages of Parkman and the chronicle of the Jesuit Relations tell us of the trials, sacrifices and martyrdoms of the Jesuit apostles, who plunged into the primeval wilderness armed only with breviary and cross to win the souls of the fierce tribes for Christ. And emulating the sons of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, the followers of Saint Francis were on hand. Bancroft says that "The first permanent efforts of French enterprise in colonizing America preceded any permanent English settlement north of the Potomac. Years before the Pilgrims anchored within Cape Cod the Roman Church had been planted by missionaries from France in the eastern moiety of Maine; and Le Caron, an unambitious Franciscan, had penetrated the land of the Mohawks, had passed to the north in the hunting grounds of the Wyandots, and, bound by his vows to the life of a beggar, had, on foot or paddling a bark canoe, gone onward and still onward, taking alms of the savages, till he reached the rivers of Lake Huron. While Quebec contained scarce fifty inhabitants, priests of the Franciscan order—Le Caron, Viel, Sagard—had labored for years as missionaries in Upper Canada or made their way to the neutral Huron tribe that dwelt on the waters of the Niagara."

It is of value to observe here that Mr. Bancroft's reference to the work of these missionaries as mere efforts of French enterprise to found French colonies in America is incorrect. These missionaries were engaged in winning heathen colonies for Christ. It may be worth while also to ask the reader to fix his attention upon the fact that these missionaries were unaccompanied by armed battalions. A faraway faint glimpse of their trials, struggles and death may be had in the written record, but the full story is known only to the Master Who inspired them. While they had crossed the seas in French ships and the majority were subjects of the King of France, they were more than Frenchmen, and the commission which they held, bearing date of 1600 years before, was a more exalted one than any issued by any French monarch or earthly potentate. Their success was large and the influence of their lives and death yet lives among the Catholic Indians of Canada and the Northwest.

They had powerful evil influences to contend with other than the untamed ferocity of the savages. At times they experienced the hostility of the French Government when controlled by atheists, and they always had to encounter the enmity of the English Protestant colonies upon the Atlantic seaboard. While the Jesuits and Franciscans were engaged in establishing mission chapels throughout the wilderness, the Protestant colonists were occupied in establishing trading posts on the edge of the wilderness in which to barter rum and tobacco for peltries and skins with the Indians. On the one side the desire was to extend the gospel; on the other to extend trade. The Puritan colony of Massachusetts Bay enacted a penal statute as early as 1647 which provided for the exclusion of Catholic priests from its jurisdiction. The statute is headed "Jesuites;" it provides condign punishment for any priest "devoted to the religion and court of Room (Rome)," and declares that if he "be taken the second time within this jurisdiction, upon lawful tryal and conviction he shall be put to death." Such was the attitude generally of the Protestant colonists towards Catholic missionaries, and such it has continued to be until within a comparatively recent period. Their attitude towards the aborigines may be gathered from the laws enacted in reference to them. In 1675 the following law was passed by the Massachusetts Bay Colony: "Ordered by the Court, that whosoever shall shoot off any gun on any unnecessary occasion, or at any game whatsoever, except at an Indian or a wolf, shall forfeit five shillings for every such shot, till further liberty shall be given."

Another law passed by the General Court held at Boston on February 21, 1675, is as follows: "Upon consideration of many skulking

Indians about our plantations, doing much mischief and damage, and a probable way for their surprisal is by scouting in small parties; for encouragement thereof;—This Court doth order that every person or persons that shall surprise, slay, or bring in prisoner any such Indian on the south side of Pascataqua River, he or they shall be allowed three pounds per head.” . . . And Mr. Bancroft in his history of the United States informs us that “The Legislature of Massachusetts by resolution in July, 1722, declared the Eastern Indians to be traitors and robbers; and while troops were raised for the war, offered private men for each Indian’s scalp—at first a bounty of fifteen pounds, and afterward of a hundred.”

The attitude of the Puritan colony toward the aborigines and the men who were endeavoring to civilize them is strikingly shown by the wanton destruction of the flourishing Jesuit mission at Norridgewock, in the wilds of Maine, and the murder of the missionary and many of his people. Bancroft recites the story in the following words: “At Norridgewock, on the banks of the Kennebec, Sebastian Rasles, for more than a quarter of a century the companion and instructor of savages, had gathered a flourishing village round the church, which, rising in the desert, made some pretensions to magnificence. Severely ascetic, using no wine, and little food except pounded maize, a rigorous observer of the days of Lent, he built his own cabin, tilled his own garden, drew for himself wood and water, prepared his own hominy, and, distributing all that he received, gave an example of religious poverty. Himself a painter, he adorned the humble walls of his church with pictures. There he gave instruction almost daily. Following his pupils to their wigwams, he tempered the spirit of devotion with familiar conversation and innocent gayety, winning the mastery over their souls by his powers of persuasion. He had trained a band of forty young savages, arrayed in cassock and surplice, to assist in the service and chant the hymns of the Church; and their public processions attracted a concourse of red men. Two chapels were built near the village, and before them the hunter muttered his prayers on his way to the river or the woods. When the tribe descended to the seaside, in the season of wild fowl, they were followed by Rasles; and on some islet a chapel of bark was quickly consecrated. In 1717 the Government of Massachusetts attempted in turn to establish a mission; and its minister made a mocking of Purgatory and the invocation of saints, of the Cross and the Rosary. ‘My Christians,’ retorted Rasles, ‘believe the truths of the Catholic faith, but are not skilful disputants,’ and he prepared a defense of the Roman Church. . . .

“The expedition to Penobscot in 1723 was under public auspices. After five days’ march through the woods, Westbrooke, with his

company, came upon the Indian settlement that was probably above Bangor, at Old Town. He found a fort seventy yards long and fifty in breadth, well protected by stockades, fourteen feet high, inclosing twenty-three houses regularly built. On the south side near at hand was the chapel, sixty feet long and thirty wide, well and handsomely furnished within and without; and south of this stood the 'friar's dwelling house.' The invaders arrived there on the 9th of March, 1723, at six in the evening. That night they set fire to the village, and by sunrise next morning every building was in ashes. Twice it was attempted to capture Rasles. At last, on the 23d of August, 1724, a party from New England had reached Norridgewock, unperceived, till they discharged their guns at the cabins. There were about fifty warriors in the place. They seized their arms and marched forth tumultuously to protect the flight of their wives and children and old men. Rasles, roused to the danger by their clamors, went forward to save his flock by drawing down upon himself the attention of the assailants, and his hope was not vain. Meantime the savages fled to the river, which they passed by wading and swimming, while the English pillaged the cabins and the church, and then set them on fire. After the retreat of the invaders, the red men returned to nurse their wounded and inter their dead. They buried Rasles beneath the spot where he used to stand before the altar."

And then Mr. Bancroft adds: "Influence by commerce took the place of influence by religion and English trading houses supplanted French missions." Such was the spirit which seems to have animated the Protestant colonists of North America in their dealings with the natives. The conversion of the Indians seems to have been of secondary importance compared with acquiring possession of title to the lands or the opportunity of driving shrewd bargains with them for the fruits of the chase. It is true that some of the Puritan clergymen like John Eliott showed considerable zeal in endeavoring to convert the sadly demoralized remnants of the aborigines in the vicinity of Massachusetts Bay and of Hartford, on the Connecticut River, but it is likewise certain that the efforts of such men proved a dismal failure. There seemed to be something lacking, a want of some essential element in their ministrations to insure success. The Indian and wolf, coupled together in the phraseology of the old Puritan statute already quoted, disappeared simultaneously; the advance of the Protestant colonists into the wilderness meant the extermination of both. Such in brief is the story of the contact of Protestantism with the aborigines of the North American continent. In a few more years when the last red man will have been gathered to his fathers, a monument might be erected over his re-

mains bearing this epitaph: "Here lies the last representative of the American Indian; done to death by Protestantism."

The United States is referred to as a Protestant or non-Catholic country because its beginnings were dominated by Protestants; they have in a great measure shaped its history; it was their impact upon and dealings with the unfortunate Indians that have proved so disastrous to the latter. The Catholic population has not been sufficiently large and united to exercise much of a saving influence in the body politic in reference to the Indians, as has been quite recently shown by the governmental treatment of the Catholic Indian schools and in various other respects. In addition to this, some American Catholics seem to have become more or less infected with pernicious ideas respecting so-called inferior races through inhaling the Protestant atmosphere surrounding them.

The last red man will soon disappear among us, but we have the problem of the black man before us for solution. The Negro we formerly held in a state of absolute subjection, but he was liberated thirty-six or thirty-seven years ago, not through any act of grace on our part, but because it was considered necessary as a war measure to save the integrity of the Union. Although the Negro has been declared politically free by the organic law of the nation, he has been, and he is regarded to-day by a great majority of the people, North as well as South, as an inferior being to the white man. His natural rights have been trampled upon by individuals and mobs; he has been denied the protection of the laws in many cases; his prospect in the future is exceedingly dark and gloomy. The color line is rigidly drawn between black and white.

Many if not all the Southern States where Negro slavery formerly existed have enacted laws prohibiting the intermarriage of black and white people and imposing penalties on clergymen who perform the marriage ceremony between them. Surely these enactments are in contravention of natural law, if not the law of God. The State of Georgia, or any other State, has no more right to prohibit or to declare invalid the marriage of a red, black or brown skinned person to a white person than it has to prohibit red-headed men and black-haired women from entering into the marriage relation. Certainly these laws and the insensate widespread racial prejudice of which they are but an expression are as opposite to Catholic thought and teaching as is the North from the South Pole. "Of one blood God hath made all mankind." Down through the ages that blessed evangel has come. It was heard by master and slave in the catacombs of Rome; it was testified to by both on the sands of the Flavian amphitheatre; it has been enunciated on the altars and from the pulpits of gorgeous Cathedrals; it has been an-

nounced in dim forest aisles on the banks of the Parana and Amazon and in the interior of Africa; on the burning sands of Hindostan, where paganism recognizes caste and privilege, the lowly pariah has heard it, and it will be heard with a fuller and more pregnant meaning when all these shameful statutes and racial prejudices against any of God's creatures are abolished.

And now that we have glanced at the effect of Protestant domination over weak races on the North American continent, let us take a glimpse at the effect of Catholicism upon similar races in South America. Macaulay says the conquest of Mexico by Cortes was an event almost similar to the conquest of the Mogul power in India by Clive. The historian draws a comparison between the events; but there the comparison ends. The characters of the Spanish and English conquerors were as dissimilar as the results which have flown from their action. Cortes was an upright, honorable gentleman and an able soldier; Clive was an unscrupulous, dishonorable man, a corruptionist and forger, but an able soldier. Each conquered an extensive territory for his sovereign. That conquered by Cortes has been advancing in population and prosperity and is now enjoying the blessings of republican government, while the territory conquered by Clive has been held in subjection by a standing army and it is scourged with periodical famines—the famine now ending having cost, according to some estimates, over a million of lives. Cortes was a crusader; Clive was an adventurous soldier, who enriched himself at the expense of his employers and of his victims. Mr. Prescott in his "Conquest of Mexico" says: "There can be no doubt that Cortes, with every man in his army, felt he was engaged in a holy crusade; and that independently of personal considerations he could not serve heaven better than by planting the cross on the blood-stained towers of the heathen metropolis."

The primary motive of the Spanish conquerors was the subjugation of the aborigines to the yoke of Christianity. When Montezuma was overthrown the first object of the victor was the reclamation of the natives from their idol worship. The loathsome religious rites in which they indulged and their abominable human sacrifices were summarily suppressed. Father Diaz, Gomara and Olmedo, who accompanied the expedition directed by Cortes, were preaching incessantly, explaining the truths of Christianity to the natives, and with such wondrous effect that multitudes were converted and were baptized.

When the conquest of practically the whole continent was secured and the Spanish or Portuguese authority was firmly established the real work of the missionary began. The Jesuit, Dominican and Franciscan set forth with burning zeal into the wilderness to Chris-

tianize and humanize the heathen tribes, some of whom were unspeakably ferocious and practiced cannibalism. Chili, Paraguay, Peru, Guatemala, Central America were soon invaded by the soldiers of the Cross, men as steadfast as St. Stephen, zealous as St. Paul and enthusiastic as St. Peter. The disciplined soldiery of Spain and Portugal could not penetrate into the interior of the country, except they went in large bodies; but the missionaries in ones and twos could and did. There was no hesitation, no faltering among these apostles of the South American continent. No difficulties, however great, daunted them. They flung worldly prudence and wisdom to the winds, and made fools of themselves for the sake of Christ's Kingdom. By ones and twos these cultured and tenderly nurtured Christian gentlemen entered the forest fastnesses to combat the Evil One and rescue the perishing native. They were unable to perceive any inferior race in the wilderness, save such as were in bondage to Satan. They scaled every mountain side, crossed every river to bring the tidings of the Son of God to every tribe.

Here is a description of the Jesuit Anchieta setting forth on his mission: "Barefooted, with no other garment than his cassock, his crucifix around his neck, the pilgrim staff and breviary in his hand and his shoulders laden with the furniture requisite for an altar, Anchieta advanced into the interior of the country; he penetrated virgin forests, swam across streams, climbed the roughest mountains, plunged into the solitude of the plains, confronted savage beasts and abandoned himself entirely to the care of Providence. . . . Sometimes when the savages rejected his first overtures he threw himself at their knees, bathing them with his tears, pressing them to his heart and striving to gain their confidence by every demonstration of love. He made himself their servant and studied their caprices like a slave."

How strangely this description of the Jesuit reads by way of contrast with that of the Puritan minister Stone, who accompanied the Massachusetts Puritans on their mission to exterminate the Pequod Indians. And Anchieta was only one out of thousands such as he who in a similar manner undertook and eventually wrought out the conversion of the aborigines on the Southern continent. This, too, despite the fact that when the Governments of Spain and Portugal came under the control of atheists such as Aranda in Spain and Pombal in Portugal, the efforts of these self-sacrificing men were stopped and the missionaries themselves for a long period of years treated as criminals. But notwithstanding every obstacle thrown in their way by corrupt Spanish and Portuguese officials, the simple fact remains that they did conquer South America for Christianity

with just such men as the Jesuit Anchieta and through just such means. The aborigines of the Southern continent, like the natives of the Philippine Islands, have been Christianized and consequently civilized in just that way.

And that is only a portion of the story. The significant point is that the aborigines of the South American continent have been steadily increasing in numbers and advancing in prosperity and influence since their conversion. Peru, Mexico, indeed almost all, if not all the South American countries have had as their chief magistrates full-blooded natives. There is no color line drawn upon the South American continent among the people. And that is not all. Negro slavery at one time obtained throughout that country. But there it did not present the most abhorrent features which it bore in the slave holding districts of the North American continent. The influence of the Catholic Church continually exerted for generations served to ameliorate the sad condition of the slave under the civil rule of Catholics. He could get married and his marriage was as indissoluble as the marriage of the master. The law of every Catholic country recognized that important fact, and further it was a provision of law in most if not all of the South American countries that the slave husband and wife could not be sold apart to different masters, but must be transferred together, and that the slave child could not be sold from the mother until it had reached a specified age. The gracious and yet stern unyielding influence of the Church in defense of the family was as a shield for the slave family in the one case; where that influence was wanting the slave was regarded as a mere chattel, a thing without natural rights, absolutely the property of the master.

Slavery no longer exists in South America; black, white and red are equal before the law. The freedom of the black race was accomplished, too, without any serious convulsion such as our Civil War. There is no color line drawn between the races in any South American country. Every person, whatever the color of the skin, is valued according to personal character. There are no "Jim Crow" cars, nor race churches, nor "nigger galleries" in theatre or other places of public amusement, nor is there any legal prohibition of marriage on account of color or race over the broad expanse of the continent. The saintly men who won the natives for Christ did their work well; they did it in the spirit of the Master whose missionaries they were.

This article has grown somewhat lengthy, but the subject is a grave one at the present moment, when the pagan concept respecting so-called inferior races is dinned into our ears by politician and preacher. It would indeed require a great volume to do even scanty

justice to the men who have brought pagan communities within the pale of Christian civilization.

To the student of history these two considerations must arise from the facts pointed out :

1. Is it not a very remarkable fact that Protestant colonization has been attended everywhere among uncivilized aborigines by their degradation and eventual destruction?

2. Is it not an equally remarkable fact that Catholic colonization has been attended everywhere with the civilization and advancement of the natives, notwithstanding serious obstacles thrown in the way of Catholic missionaries by pseudo Catholic authorities who at times wielded the civil power?

Some Protestant writers have attempted to explain why the American people have failed with Indian and Negro. They ascribe it to what they term the masterful spirit of the Anglo-Saxon race, which they allege is so constituted that it cannot recognize the equality of weak peoples. Pride of race, we are told, is the cause. But this explanation boldly assumes that the population of the United States is chiefly of British origin or extraction, while the contrary is the fact, a great majority of the American people being of other than of British origin or extraction. The Anglo-Saxon race myth is but a lame excuse for a valid explanation. Surely the masterful Spaniard in whose veins coursed the undiluted blood of Castile and Arragon entertained as high a pride of race as the conglomerate population of the United States, of which Europe, not England, is the mother country, and many of whom fled to escape the tooth of poverty or the grip of military service in their native land.

The true explanation of the remarkable contrast is that the spirit of the Catholic Church was on the one side, the spirit of commercialism and Protestantism animated the other. The Count De Maistre gave expression to the true explanation in these words: "Christianity is Catholicity, and Catholicity is Christianity; they are identical in every sense."

JAMES E. WRIGHT.

Boston, Mass.

THE TRUE CRITICAL TEST OF NATURAL SELECTION.

WE are all Darwinians now. The intention in this article is to inquire whether we may not be so in advance of the evidence.

We are well aware that there are many who try to make a distinction between evolution and Darwinism. There are many Catholic writers even who profess to be able to make such a distinction. They will tell us that though Darwinism may be false, evolution is still true. But we have yet failed to find any writer who professed to make such a distinction who was able to withstand the current for any length of time, and who did not find himself finally engulfed in the vortex of Darwinism itself. The fact is that there is no other form of evolution before the world at the present day that is worth a moment's notice. Even those who undertake to combat Darwinism are forced to take his doctrine of natural selection as the main and prime factor of evolution. There is, indeed, division in the school of evolution, but all the various divisions, with one insignificant exception, accept natural selection as primarily the basis of the doctrine. The various divisions in the school of evolution group themselves into three principal classes. First come the Neo-Darwinians—as Mr. Herbert Spencer has somewhat contemptuously styled them—and who are, as the same authority has said, more Darwinian than Darwin himself. To this school belong Professor Weismann and his followers. They endeavor to prove that natural selection is able to account for everything. This is the end of all their labors, the burden of all their controversies. Their new-fangled doctrines of Panmixia, of special determinants, of *plus* and *minus* variations have been all invented for the purpose of explaining away the difficulties of natural selection and answering the objections to it. Next in order comes the school of Mr. Herbert Spencer, who having partially renounced his allegiance to Darwin and natural selection, nevertheless still stoutly maintains that it, and it alone, can account for the major part of the facts, while maintaining that another portion of the facts can be accounted for only by the inheritability of functionally produced changes. The third division, of which Professor Henslow is one of the principal leaders, it is true, excludes natural selection altogether; but as the principle which they substitute in whole for it is the Lamarckian theory, which was laughed out of existence a century ago, the influence of the school carries but little weight. Hence we see that the Darwinian doctrine of natural selection still dominates the entire school of the Neo-Darwinians,

who still regard it, in a more or less modified form, as the sole factor in the production of all phenomena ; while the school of Mr. Spencer admits that it has been at least the principal factor. Moreover, many of those who indulge in the luxury of "special views" on the subject of evolution make natural selection the basis or groundwork of their new theories. Hence we find that natural selection still occupies by far the largest place in the theory of evolution, and that were Darwinism, as it is called, subtracted from the doctrine, there would be little left worthy of attention. This being premised, we may proceed to an examination of the doctrine of natural selection itself.

Mr. Darwin's attempt in his famous work was, first, to show that species may be originated by natural selection ; secondly, to show that natural causes are competent to select ; and, thirdly, that, to express it generally, to natural selection as to a cause may be traced all the phenomena of species. Have forty odd years of trial borne out the truth of Mr. Darwin's principles ? Let us see.

Lest we might be accused of injustice in dealing with the doctrine of Mr. Darwin by applying false methods of criticism, let us adopt the form employed by Mr. Huxley himself when he first dealt with the theory. Not even the most orthodox Darwinian can suspect a form of criticism emanating from such a source.

In his very first critique of the now famous doctrine Professor Huxley laid down three criteria to be applied as tests of its truth. They were, in his own words : "Is it satisfactorily proved, in fact, that species may be originated by selection ? that there is such a thing as natural selection ? that none of the phenomena exhibited by species are inconsistent with the origin of species in this way ?"

With the first two criteria of Professor Huxley—Is it proved that species may be originated by selection ? and is there such a thing as natural selection ?—there is no fault to find. The third, however, must be peremptorily challenged. The consistency of the phenomena exhibited by species with the theory of natural selection would by no means amount to a proof of that theory. It might remove difficulties. It might show that the theory was probable, but it could never attain the dignity of a proof. History is full of instances in which, to all seeming, a given cause was quite consistent with all the effects, but which, nevertheless, proved not to be a *causa vera* at all. Whatever value, then, the third member of Professor Huxley's standard possesses is of a negative, not a positive nature. It smooths the way. It invites examination, even confidence ; but it does not compel assent. With this weakness admitted, the third member even may be permitted to stand. In testing the hypothesis, however, Professor Huxley overlooked two points essential to a

true critical analysis, and without which the three he has used would be absolutely worthless. They are: First, does it explain all the facts? and, secondly, does it explain them better than any other hypothesis? With these necessary corrections and additions, the importance of which no one will deny, we may proceed to the examination of natural selection; first, however, recasting Professor Huxley's three in their logical order. The logical order would run thus: (1) Is there such a thing as natural selection? (2) Is it satisfactorily proven that species can be originated by it? (3) Is it consistent with all the facts? (4) Does it explain all the facts? (5) Does it explain them better than any other theory?

To the very first question: Is there such a thing as natural selection? evolutionists are, after forty years of inquiry, unable to give an affirmative answer. No one has ever seen it. No one dare affirm that it really exists. When Mr. Darwin first propounded his startling theory to the world, nearly half a century ago, he did not feel warranted in maintaining that natural selection actually existed. He undertook, indeed, to prove that it might, could, should exist; that, in fact, to meet the requirements of his theory it ought to exist; but he never mustered up sufficient courage to proclaim its actual existence. No one since his day professes to have discovered it. No one has held it up to the gaze of an admiring world and proclaimed loudly: "Eureka, I have found it." If we pass from Mr. Darwin to Professor Huxley matters do not mend much. Professor Huxley admitted candidly that "Mr. Darwin does not so much prove that natural selection does occur as that it must occur;" and his justification of Mr. Darwin on this point is nothing if not puerile. He says: "In fact, no other sort of demonstration is attainable," which is, to say the least, neither very reassuring nor very scientific. It is nothing but the old *circulus vitiosus*, which in this particular instance tells us that we know evolution takes place because there is such a thing as natural selection to cause it; and we know that there is such a thing as natural selection because the doctrine of evolution requires it. His further attempt to defend Mr. Darwin's position is simply a pleading of the baby act. He adds: "A race does not attract our attention in nature until it has, in all probability (mark the probability) existed for a considerable time, and then it is too late to inquire into the conditions of its origin." That is to say, in other words: perhaps natural selection exists, and perhaps we could prove that it does actually exist were it not for the wretched perversity of a probable condition which perhaps, too, has an existence, and which, perhaps, interferes with our demonstration. And so we leave the great master and the great coryphæus of the mighty movement without much light on the question. When we come to Mr.

VOL. XXVI—10

Spencer we become bewildered and perplexed. It has been elsewhere seen that he is at one and the same time both the champion and the foe of natural selection, and this rather anomalous position leads him into strange contradictions. He blows hot and cold with the same mouth, asserting boldly on one page what he contradicts on the next. Yet, like all the other evolutionists, while he is ready to make an act of faith in natural selection when it suits his argument, and while he at times speaks of it with as much confidence as if it were an actual existence which he beheld before his eyes, like them, too, when he is placed upon the witness stand and forced to speak the language of reason and logic, he will tell us that "the facts at present assignable in direct proof that by progressive modifications races of organisms which are apparently distinct from antecedent races have descended from them, *are not sufficient*;" in other words, that natural selection has failed to establish proof of its existence. Again, in one of his fiercely-fought battles with the Neo-Darwinians, speaking of natural selection, he makes this contemptuous retort: "We might naturally suppose that their own hypothesis (of natural selection) is unassailable. Yet, strange to say, they admit that there is *no direct proof that any species has been established by natural selection*. The proof is *inferential* only." Which admission in the hands of an anti-evolutionist at once becomes a two-edged sword as destructive to the natural selection maintained by Mr. Spencer himself as to the form of it held by the Neo-Darwinians, and which shows clearly that, so far at least, no one dares maintain that there is direct proof for the existence of natural selection. And as if to throw as much discredit on the theory as possible, Mr. Spencer further adds: "When to uncertainties in the arguments supporting the hypothesis we add its inability to explain facts of cardinal significance, as proved above, there is, I think, ground for asserting that natural selection is less clearly shown to be a factor in the origin of species than is the inheritance of functionally wrought changes."

But if there be any proof of the existence of natural selection it certainly should be found among the Neo-Darwinians. Their doctrine demands it. They are uncompromising in their insistence on Darwinism. Their work has been, not to contradict the work of the great master or set up rival claimants, but to expound his teachings, mayhap to strengthen them when found weak. There, if anywhere, should be preserved in tablets of gold the proofs of its existence. And truly enough Professor Weismann, the leader of the school, comes nearest to furnishing us with traces of its existence. But, alas! even here the proof is merely negative, and even at that it is controverted by Mr. Spencer. In

endeavoring to account for the soldier-neuters which exist among certain kinds of ants, Professor Weismann says: "It is just because no other explanation is conceivable that it is *necessary for us to accept the principle of natural selection.*" Of course Mr. Spencer, with whom reasons for anything and everything are always as plentiful as blackberries, at once furnishes him a reason other than natural selection; but what concerns us here is neither the truth nor falsehood of the reasons of either scientist, but the extreme poverty of the strongest proof which Darwinism furnishes for the existence of its idol. But even this proof, such as it is, and contradicted, too, as it is by Mr. Spencer, is further discounted by a statement of Professor Weismann himself, in which he tells us "*that it is really very difficult to imagine the process of natural selection in its details, and to this day it is impossible to demonstrate it in any one point.*" And so after forty years of observation and analysis the existence of natural selection is just as shadowy as ever. The fact is that natural selection is the Mrs. Harris of the world of evolution. The illustrious Sairey Gamp found that mythical personage a very useful factor in all her achievements. Her name overawed Sairey's companions. An infinite fund of possibilities as well as counterfeit actualities, according to the veracious Mrs. Gamp, lay hidden in that entity which itself always seemed to court the background. To Mrs. Harris Sairey constantly appealed. Mrs. Harris' praises were continually on her lips. Mrs. Harris' picture was pointed out to every new-comer. But that much quoted individual never deigned to appear in the flesh. No one had ever seen her. She was known only to Mrs. Gamp. Mrs. Gamp's companions had longed for a glimpse of her beauty, possibly for a share of her patronage. And the immortal Betsey Prig, driven to desperation by having constantly dinned in her ears virtues and charms which were denied to her eyes, at last mutinied against this species of absentee despotism. In a fatal moment the baffled Betsey, unconsciously grasping the force of the axiom, "*De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio,*" gave utterance to the awful words: "Bother Mrs. Harris!" And while Sairey Gamp stood stock still, speechless at the awful blasphemy, scarcely believing her own ears, the undismayed Betsey, as Mrs. Gamp's veracious historian avers, followed up with these memorable and tremendous words: "I don't believe there's no sich person." Once afterwards, and once only, did Mrs. Gamp venture to quote Mrs. Harris, but the effort was accompanied with such spasmodic action and gasping that it was never repeated. *Verbum sap.* Let Darwinians beware. The virtues, the powers, the charms of natural selection have been extolled before the world for well-nigh half a century. We have been asked to admire its picture—a rather dim one—in the workings of nature. Sairey Gamp's

mythical friend was never paraded before her friends with half the energy with which the followers of Darwin paraded natural selection. But it was always in speech. No mortal eye was ever permitted to see the wonder—not even unto this day. A long-suffering world may some day rise up against the established tyranny of the yoke and with as much justice as Betsey Prig rudely vociferate: “Bother natural selection!” and complete its downfall by further adding: “I don’t believe there’s no sich thing.”

Indeed, the very existence of the supreme factor of evolution is to-day in doubt quite as much as it was half a century ago. If not, who has seen it at work? Where are the demonstrable evidences of it to be found? What traces of its existence has it left behind? Who will venture to assert that its existence has been proved as the existence of gravitation has been demonstrated? The most intrepid Darwinian dare not presume to proclaim its existence as an established fact. The strongest proof we have of it is precisely of the same calibre as the proof of the existence of Mrs. Harris. And what lends additional force in the matter is that in the case of special creation absence of proof of its existence was one of the primary, nay one of the palmary counts in the indictment against that doctrine. “No one ever saw a special creation,” triumphantly proclaimed Mr. Spencer, and special creationism, blushing with shame and confusion, fled precipitately from the court. Should the special creationist undertake to turn the tables on the Darwinians at the present time, he could do so on at least equally logical grounds. Hence we see that on the first count natural selection totally fails.

When we come to the second: Can species be originated by natural selection? the answer is even more disastrous. After forty years of observation and experiment the answer of Professor Huxley still holds in all its force; nay, on account of the failure of so many experiments, in greater force than ever. Professor Huxley’s answer was: “After much consideration . . . it is our clear conviction that, as the evidence stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characteristics exhibited by species in Nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural.” This little rift within the lute, as he called it, has been widening. No evolutionist will claim that we are now nearer a satisfactory answer to this question than when Professor Huxley wrote. If proof be needed from living authorities, let those already given from Mr. Spencer suffice, inasmuch as they cover the ground as well for Mr. Spencer himself as for the Neo-Darwinians. “We might naturally suppose,” he says, “that their own hypothesis was unsailable. Yet, strange to say, they admit that there is no direct proof that *any species has been established by natural selection*. The proof

is *inferential* only." And he forthwith proceeds to demolish this "inferential proof," concluding with these words:

"When to uncertainties in the arguments supporting the hypothesis we add its inability to explain facts of cardinal significance . . . there is, I think, ground for asserting that natural selection is less clearly shown to be a factor in the origination of species than is the inheritance of functionally-wrought changes."

These admissions would be quite sufficient, without going any further, to answer the question: Has species been originated by natural selection? but we shall add one more from Mr. Spencer. Commenting on an admission of Professor Weismann's, which we have already quoted from his article on "The All-Sufficiency of Natural Selection," and in which he says "that it is really very difficult to imagine this process of natural selection in its details; and to this day it is impossible to demonstrate it in any one point," Mr. Spencer very pertinently presses the matter home by inquiring: "But now if the sufficiency of an assigned cause cannot in any case be demonstrated, and if it is 'really very difficult to imagine' in what way it has produced its alleged effects, what becomes of the 'all-sufficiency' of the cause? How can its all-sufficiency be alleged when it can be neither demonstrated nor easily imagined? Evidently to fit Professor Weismann's argument, the title of the article should have been 'The Doubtful Sufficiency of Natural Selection.'"

This failure of natural selection to originate a new species, which we learn from the admissions of the evolutionists themselves, is equally demonstrated by observation and experiment. During almost half a century the doctrine has been before the world. During that time a body of active inquirers has been constantly engaged in seeking a verification of the theory by experiment and trial. Has it been shown during all that time that selection has developed a new species? To the stimulus of the glory awaiting scientific discovery was added the motive of profitable industry. Stock-raisers, horse and cattle-breeders, dog-fanciers, poultry-fanciers, agriculturists and florists, all lovers of variety, as well as experimentalists and naturalists by profession, have been eagerly industrious in the work of selective breeding. All the resources of nature have been reinforced by all the ingenuity of art. During all that period has a new species been originated by selection, either artificial or natural? In spite of protests to the contrary, the time has been ample for large results, especially in the case of short-lived specimens. While natural selection alone and unaided might be expected to show some results during that period, much might be looked for where nature was so strongly seconded by art. Yet while artificial selection has resulted in variations without number, nowhere can it be shown to have resulted in a new species.

But, we are told, it takes thousands of years—perhaps eons—to originate a new species. Such is the explanation which evolution from the outset imposed on a credulous generation. Such was the pretext of Darwin. Such has been the argument of Huxley. Such is the doctrine of Spencer. And we may add such is the generally accepted belief in the world of evolution to-day. If pressed further, the question is asked why such a long period should be required; the evolutionists have nothing to say, but change the subject as quickly as possible. To this wretched subterfuge, however, which has so long masqueraded in the guise of science, there may be given briefly three answers: First, that it is a wholly unwarrantable assumption, without stronger foundation than mere conjecture. Even so, it is an appeal *ad ignorantiam*, an awsome phrase to conceal our ignorance; whereas, the business of science—and indeed the especial duty of natural selection as proclaimed by its founders—is not to mystify, but to clear up and explain. In the second place, it is difficult to conceive how or why it should take thousands of years to effect a change of species in organisms which have only an ephemeral existence, since the required variation must take place during the brief existence of some one individual organism. And since between the species *ex qua* and the species *ad quam* countless myriads of the variants could have lived—and consequently countless myriads of variations have taken place—during the period of a century, or even within a period of forty years, it is somewhat singular that all the acute observations of science have not been able to detect the developing and developed species as well as all the intermediate variations which bridge the abyss between them. Indeed, the assumption that a long period of time is required to effect a change of species in the case of short-lived organisms is negated by the parallelism which the Darwinians themselves insist upon tracing everywhere between the individual and the species. That it should require eons of time for the rise of a species whose individuals are characterized by shortness of life and rapid breeding is a curve in the parallels of phylogeny and ontogeny which Darwinians might find it difficult to explain. Again, in the third place, the slowness of the process of change of species is wholly at variance with the conception of natural selection itself. For according to the theory of natural selection, the rise of a new species is nothing more or less than a single stage in the process of variation. But why this single stage in the process of variation should require untold eons for its appearance, while all the other stages of variation occur instantly, is what no evolutionist has yet undertaken to explain. The fact is that no evidence having been forthcoming for the transmutation of species, evolutionists have

been obliged to seek a remedy for the difficulty somewhere, and that accordingly they have taken refuge in the abyss of time as being the least likely to betray them.¹ It appears, however, that even the abyss of time has, quite recently, come to be regarded as a not altogether secure refuge, and a new remedy for the difficulty has been discovered by no less a personage than Mr. Spencer himself. This last expedient highly deserves the foremost place among the curiosities of literature as well as the curiosities of science. It is nothing more or less than that the question of the origin of species—the question which to the scientific world has been for the last half century the question of questions, the question which during that period has been the be-all and the end-all of evolutionary science—is now of no consequence whatever. It is “irrelevant.” It “is beside the question.” It is merely a “collateral” result. The proper answer to the question is to “ignore” it. The curious passage is too long to quote at length, so we shall condense it.

“The centre,” he tells us, “around which the collision of arguments has taken place is the question of the formation of species. But here we see that this question is a *secondary* and, in a sense, *irrelevant* one. (Italics ours.) Whether organic forms “are or are not marked off by *specific traits*, and whether *they will or will not breed together, matters little*.” Even if they do, it is not an essential, “but a collateral result.” . . . The biologic atmosphere has been *vitiated* by conceptions of past naturalists . . . who regarded the *traits which enabled them to mark off their specimens from one another as the traits of most importance in Nature*. But after *ignoring* these technical ideas, it becomes manifest that the distinctions, morphological or physiological, taken as tests of species, *are merely incidental phenomena*.” But what else has been the aim of speculative science for the last forty years but to endeavor to explain the origin of species? What has been the goal of observation and experiment? What have meant the labors of Darwin, of Huxley, of even Mr. Spencer himself, as well as of their hosts of industrious disciples, but to bridge the chasms that separate species from species, to level the walls of adamant that separate them; in a word, to solve the question which Mr. Spencer now discovers to be merely “secondary,” “collateral,” “irrelevant,” and the proper treatment of which is “to ignore” it altogether? Mr. Spencer’s novel position would be extremely ludicrous if it were not extremely pathetic. For it must be remembered that with the fall of the origin of species

¹ The objections brought against the Darwinian hypothesis by Agassiz, Pictet and Sedgwick, and parried but not answered by Mr. Darwin, also apply here. These paleontologists showed from the geological record that whole groups of allied species *suddenly* appear in certain formations, and although the geological record is the Bible, Koran and Talmud in one, of Darwinism, Mr. Darwin’s only reply was an appeal to the imperfection of the geological record.

by means of natural selection he sees his own life-work coming tumbling about his ears. But while Mr. Spencer is pleased to ignore the distinction of species, nature by no means ignores it. It is still as stubborn a fact as if Mr. Spencer had never disapproved of it, and yet remains to be accounted for. For the outcome of all experiment, observation, theory, hypothesis, speculation, inquiry, research for the past forty years has been—what? To show that natural selection has originated a new species? To demonstrate conclusively that natural selection can originate a new species? To prove the truth of the theory which science undertook to establish as truth? Assuredly no. On the contrary, the result has been to establish more firmly than ever the immutability of physiological species, to show that the impregnable walls which divide species from species are still as impenetrable as ever, and that the only law of species which may not be successfully controverted is the law which science started out to disprove—the law of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis; that herb, and plant, and tree, and shrub, and every living thing should bring forth fruit after its kind. Indeed, so far is natural selection from standing the test of the second question: Has it originated or can it originate a new species? that, on the contrary, it has proved a veritable Balaam, blessing where it meant to curse and cursing where it meant to bless. The answer to the second question is worse than failure. All the evidence it gives is in favor of the opposing counsel.

The third test: Is natural selection consistent with all the known facts? seems at first sight to be the stronghold of natural selection. The late Professor Huxley has indeed left on record that "it cannot be shown to be inconsistent with any of the known facts" of science; but this, as we have seen, is at best but a negative proof, or, to speak more correctly, a mere presumption in its favor. The known facts of science are to the unknown as a point to infinity, and even were it true (as it is not) that natural selection is not inconsistent with any of the known facts of science, to-morrow or the day after may bring to light a multitude of facts totally at variance with it. The waysides of history are strewn with the wreckage of theories which for the time being were supposed to be consistent with all the known facts which the theories were supposed to explain. The late Duke of Argyll, for instance, once showed Professor Huxley, to his deep and bitter mortification, how Bathybius at one time could not only "not be shown to be inconsistent with any of the facts," but that on the contrary, it was consistent with all of them; and how, nevertheless, it soon proved to be an exceeding false and foolish hypothesis. A Darwinian speculation regarding the formation of coral reefs was found for the moment to be "not inconsistent with any of the known

facts" concerning these strange formations; nay, it even accounted for them splendidly and minutely; nevertheless, when the truth was discovered, the speculation was gathered to the ashes of baseless hypotheses. The corpuscular theory of light and the geocentric system were both found to be in harmony with the known facts, but both are now relegated to the limbo of defunct theories. Hence, even were we to admit Professor Huxley's statement that the theory of evolution cannot be shown to be inconsistent with any of the facts, the value of natural selection is not thereby greatly enhanced. At best this would only constitute a presumption in its favor. But this consistency with facts cannot be admitted at all. Mr. Spencer's testimony on this point will be far more acceptable than ours; hence we quote him. For instance, Mr. Spencer—dealing with the cellular doctrine, and showing how the individual cells of a living organism have all sprung from a single nucleated cell, become clusters of nucleated cells, and go on ever multiplying and modifying, thus forming the tissues and organs of the living animal, the while each cell carries on its own independent individual life—tells us that "On the hypothesis of evolution this universal trait has to be accepted not as a fact *that is strange but unmeaning*." Here, according to Mr. Spencer, is a fact, or, rather, a whole body of general facts, wholly at variance with natural selection. The natural selectionist will be forced here to quarrel either with Mr. Spencer's facts or with his conclusion. To us it is immaterial which he elects.

Again, in endeavoring to show how complex forms of matter have arisen from a degree less complex, Mr. Spencer tells us: "In the absence of that cyclical series of metamorphoses which even the simplest living thing now shows us, as a result of its inherited constitution, *there could be no point d'appui for natural selection*." Again, Mr. Spencer comes to our aid in showing that natural selection is not always consistent with all the known facts, when he tells us that "Especially in the case of powers which do not subserve self-preservation in appreciable degrees does development by natural selection appear *impracticable*." And once exasperated beyond all endurance by the nagging of the Neo-Darwinians, Mr. Spencer, Samson-like, is even ready to pull down the temple on his own head, forgetting his own safety in his determination to compass the destruction of his tormentors. He comes out into the open and explicitly accuses natural selection of its inconsistency with facts, when in his attempt to explain the case of the Amazon ants—which are unable to feed themselves—he tells us that even "the old hypothesis of special creation *is more consistent and comprehensible*" than natural selection. So that according to Mr. Spencer, what was supposed

to be the stronghold of natural selection cannot be accorded the dignity of even a negative proof or favorable presumption.

We now come to the fourth test of the doctrine, and it is really the crucial one. For even though it were shown that there is such a thing as natural selection, even though it were clearly proven that species could be originated by it, and even though it were shown not to be inconsistent with any known fact, unless it explains all the facts, the theory is worthless. Does it then explain all the facts? It would, indeed, be difficult to find a scientist of any repute who holds that it does explain all the facts of biological science. Professor Huxley left among his last utterances the confession that natural selection was "not at once *competent to explain all the facts* of biological science," although he maintained that it was not inconsistent with any. Mr. Spencer, as we have already seen, tells us "that it by no means explains all that has to be explained, that it leaves us without a key to many phenomena of organic evolution," and that a "very extensive part of the facts" cannot be ascribed to it. But what need is there of quotation? Did not Mr. Spencer write his "Factors of Organic Evolution" for the express purpose of showing its inadequacy? Was it not because of its inadequacy to explain that he sought to discover new factors to explain what natural selection had failed to explain? Has he not within the last decade written four different articles, now collected under the title of "The Inadequacy of Natural Selection," fully to demonstrate its failure? Has he not confronted the Neo-Darwinians with three different problems insoluble by natural selection and told them that "failure to solve any one (*italics* Mr. Spencer's) would, I think, alone prove the Neo-Darwinian doctrines untenable; and the fact that we have three unsolved problems seems to me to be fatal?" Indeed, has not Mr. Spencer, since the middle of the last decade, bent all his energies to the task of showing that natural selection is utterly incompetent to account for all the facts of biological science, and that the doctrine of the inheritance of functionally-produced modifications is absolutely necessary to carry on the work of explanation where it fails? The truth is that any one who wishes for a refutation of the doctrine of natural selection need only open Mr. Spencer's later writings to find proof in abundance of the inadequacy of natural selection to explain all the facts of biological science.

And if we go to Mr. Spencer's opponents, who still affect to believe that natural selection is all-sufficing, we find that in order to solve the problems inexplicable by natural selection they are obliged to supplement it by such processes as Panmixia, special determinants, *plus* and *minus* variations. The vascular system, the muscular system, the nervous system, the varied bodily and

mental faculties in man; the higher powers, such as the artistic and the æsthetic faculties, so highly developed in some particular instances in the human family; the increase in weight of the head of the bison and moose deer; the enormous horns of the extinct Irish elk, sometimes weighing more than a hundred-weight, as we are told—these and many others of like difficulty form the real crux of natural selection. With all the straining and stretching of the doctrine by the Darwinians, natural selection cannot be made to cover these cases; while in such cases as the dwindling away of organs, for instance; the supposed revolution of the reproductive system in mammals; and, to descend to particular cases, the singular combination of the physiological and the psychological processes in what are called the mason wasps; natural selection stands completely dumfounded and absolutely speechless. Or, if we take the familiar case of the close connection between the structural change in the vocal organs in man and his sexual development, evolutionists of every school will candidly admit that it is wholly inexplicable on the hypothesis of natural selection, even when that doctrine is reinforced by the new theories, whether of gemmules, or determinants, or germ cells and sperm cells, or physiological units.

We shall add one further instance in which Mr. Spencer combats the doctrine by a *reductio ad absurdum*. It is that of the colored rings in the peacock's tail and the wonderful symmetry of the arrangement by which the eyes in the ends of the feathers fall into line, both as to color and position, so as to form from the separate threads in each feather the beautiful and symmetric whole. In attempting to account for it on a basis of natural selection the only available explanation would be that of special determinants—a hypothesis of the Neo-Darwinians which simply means that every variable part in an organism must have a special determinant which decides in every instance the form and function of this particular part, this determinant being of necessity contained in the microscopic head of the spermatozoön from which the organism derives its existence. Mr. Spencer has calculated that in order to give the color to the four wings of a butterfly no less than two hundred thousand of these special determinants would be necessary. And in the case of the tail of a peacock, he figures that there are three hundred threads in each feather, and that each thread bears on an average sixteen hundred processes, each process requiring a special determinant. Hence he very justly concludes that according to the doctrine of natural selection, for each feather four hundred and eighty thousand of these determinants would be necessary, and consequently for the whole tail many millions. And when to these we add the determinants for all the other feathers, and also for the different variable parts of the

body at large, and then recollect that all these millions of determinants must have been contained in the microscopic head of a spermatozoon, we shall be ready to exclaim with Mr. Spencer: "Hardly a credible supposition." Evolutionists have imagined all manner of explanations for the difficulties they meet with; but, as Mr. Spencer confesses:

"Imagination, whatever license may be given, utterly fails us. At last, then, we are obliged to admit that the actual organizing process transcends conception. It is not enough to say that we cannot know it; we must say that we cannot even conceive it."

Hence not only has the origin of species not been discovered and not only has the origin of life not been solved, but there is still a large body of residual phenomena, a large number of facts that natural selection admits its inability to account for; as Mr. Spencer phrases it: "There remain many unsolved problems." Consequently subjected to this, the real test, we find that on the authority of evolutionists of every shade, not only has natural selection, but all the other theories as well, whether taken individually or collectively, been utterly discredited.

The fifth test is hardly worth considering, for it is hardly conceivable how a theory which fails utterly to account for all the facts of biological phenomena can be regarded as explaining them better than any other. From a scientific point of view it is not a question as to which has succeeded best, but as to which has most conspicuously failed. We are not arguing the case for special creation. We are merely demonstrating the utter failure of evolution by means of natural selection. But the nature of this last test of the doctrine challenges at once a consideration of the comparative merits of the two theories. An exhaustive comparison would extend this article beyond due limits, but a few leading points may be briefly indicated.

In the first place, a claimant already in possession has at least the right of possession as against all usurpers; all recognize in such cases such right of possession. In the next place, the title of such a claimant is usually regarded as strengthened, or at least not impaired, when such usurpers and pretenders fail to establish their pretensions. In the third place, the title of such a claimant is far superior to that of the rival claimant or pretender who fails to prove his claims.² Special creation is the claimant in possession—has been in possession during the entire period of man's history. Natural selection is one of the pretenders and usurpers—and one of the usurpers that has confessedly failed to establish its claims. Two years after the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species," Pro-

² *Special* creation is not a dogma of religion, but of science. Linnæus was the first to formulate the doctrine in his famous stately phrase: *Species tot sunt quot diversas formas ab initio produxit Infinitus Eius.*

fessor Huxley, in his overweening confidence that the Darwinian hypothesis was bound to succeed, remarked concerning special creation :

"Two years ago, in fact, . . . their position (special creation) seemed more impregnable than ever, if not by its own inherent strength, at any rate by the obvious failure of all the attempts which had been made to carry it."

Professor Huxley evidently did not then dream that in less than half a century the same words could be used in connection with the admitted failure of Darwinism "to carry" the position of special creation; and that, to use his own reasoning, that position seems now "more impregnable than ever by the obvious failure" of Darwinism.

Let us briefly enumerate the points where Darwinism has confessedly failed and we shall find that they are the all-important points, the points essential to a victory. First comes the gulf dividing inorganic from organic matter which science had promised to bridge for us, but where every attempt has met with ignominious failure. The distinguishing element between the organic as separating it from the inorganic world is not so much the presence of an organism as the presence of a principle to which the organism ministers, which is nowadays termed the vital principle and commonly called life. What light has natural selection thrown on life? "Under what form are we to conceive the dynamic element" in life? "Is this principle of activity inherent in organic matter, or is it something super-added?" "Is there one kind of vital principle for all kinds of organisms, or is there a separate kind for each?" "How are we to conceive that genesis of a vital principle which must go along with the genesis of an organism?" In the presence of these and hundreds of other similar questions which science set out to answer, it stands dumb and confounded. Mr. Spencer sums up its failure thus :

"In brief, then, we are obliged to confess that Life in its essence cannot be conceived in physico-chemical terms. The required principle of activity, which we found cannot be represented in living matter. If by assuming its inherence we think the facts are accounted for, we do but cheat ourselves with pseud ideas."³

Next comes the transition from plant life to animal life. It is indeed true that natural selectionists claim to have bridged over this gulf, yet we must confess that we have never seen the structure so securely adjusted as to ensure a safe passage over it. Mr. Darwin himself never actually believed that there was such a transition. He believed that plants and animals had entirely distinct origins. His words are: "I believe that animals are descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or lesser num-

³ It is not a little singular that Mr. Spencer, as he somewhere tells us, saw fit to omit that part of his vast programme which should deal with the transition from inorganic to organic matter. Is it not also a little significant? Two whole volumes, he tells us, were omitted by him—volumes which should bear directly on this subject.

ber." It is true he seemed inclined to go still further, but admitted that in taking such a step he would be led only by analogy, and he very wisely remarks: "But analogy may be a deceitful guide."

Again, the hiatus between man and the other animals is one of the difficulties which natural selection has again and again declared as triumphantly solved, but which still persists—rather perversely indeed—in still coming up for solution. To use a slang but somewhat expressive phrase, it refuses to remain solved. Then we have the immutability of species. As has been shown, natural selection has egregiously failed to solve the very question here which it set out to solve. The different species remain still independent, immutable, invariable. They rise up like so many atolls out of the biologic sea, with walls sheer and with the outside waters separating them from their neighbors of unfathomable depth. They are still as distinct from one another as separate mountain peaks whose bases meet, but whose snow-capped summits can never intermingle. Indeed, the investigations of natural selection have all gone to show that each physiological species is a walled castle whose frowning battlements sternly forbid all approach or intercourse of neighboring species. So much so indeed that as we have already seen Mr. Spencer has at last concluded that the proper treatment of such feudal exclusiveness is to entirely ignore it. And lastly we have the large realm of facts which natural selection confesses its inability to explain. These are common, everyday facts which unsought have obtruded themselves upon the notice of scientists; and doubtless were any one to undertake *ex professo* to discover still others, the number might be increased a hundredfold. Add to these the deeper questions which natural selection does not dare to touch upon at all, and the ignominious confession that, in many of the solutions it claims to have arrived at, it has employed symbol and mystery, pseud ideas or symbolic conceptions of the illegitimate order—which at the outset it so mercilessly branded with fiercest condemnation—and we have in brief the humiliating story of natural selection's admitted failure. This failure Mr. Spencer thus sums up:

"Thus the process of organic evolution is far from being fully understood. We can only suppose that as there are devised by human beings many puzzles apparently unanswerable till the answer is given, and many necromantic tricks which seem impossible till the mode of performance is shown, so there are apparently incomprehensible results which are really achieved by natural processes. Or otherwise we must conclude that since Life itself proves to be in its ultimate nature inconceivable, there is probably an inconceivable element in its ultimate workings."

The failure then of natural selection is not only proved, but admitted; so that to return to our question of the comparative merits of natural selection and special creation, we may now let Professor Huxley answer it for us. He told us, as we have seen above, that

when Darwinism first flung its glove into the arena to challenge special creation, that doctrine "seemed more impregnable than ever . . . by the obvious failure of all the attempts which had been made to carry it." Since that time evolution by means of natural selection has been the only challenger; and as, by the confession of Mr. Spencer, evolution by means of natural selection has ignominiously failed, we do not see why Professor Huxley's reasoning will not apply as well now as it did half a century ago, and the conclusion be as legitimate now as it was then; that the position of special creation is "more impregnable than ever, if not by its own inherent strength, at any right by the obvious failure" of evolution.

Still we hold no brief for special creation. We are willing to accept the doctrine of evolution when the evidence in its favor justifies in so doing, but it surely cannot be our fault if the reasoning of the evolutionists themselves, coupled with their admissions of failure, forces us to accept the former as the only theory left us. There may be added further that, as compared with natural selection, special creation would seem to have all the force of logic and dignity on its side. For in ascribing at the outset all the changes manifested by phenomena to a Being of infinite intelligence and infinite skill, it at once assigned an adequate cause for all phenomena. All that could be further expected of it logically was to establish the relation of effect and cause. It was relieved of the task of accounting for difficulties by simply referring them to this cause whose ways it declared inscrutable and whose wonders were incomprehensible. This position was eminently logical. Natural selection, on the other hand, starting out with a rigid exclusion of the supernatural and everything which transcended conception, boldly unfurled its banner, on which was inscribed the motto: "All phenomena must be solved by simply rational processes," and now it finds itself forced by stress of circumstances to admit its mistake and to refer back all its difficulties to sources which transcend conception—the very process against which it primarily revolted. At the same time, with noisy and boisterous clamor, it decried special creation and drove it from the field, while it loudly boasted that it was ready to solve all difficulties by natural methods. Now it is forced ignominiously to confess that it finds those difficulties insoluble. Thus we find that on every point of a true and logical critique the evidence for natural selection utterly breaks down.

Some years ago some enemy of man's peace devised a puzzle of the kind above alluded to by Mr. Spencer. The contrivance was simplicity itself, almost primitiveness. It consisted of a little wooden shallow frame four or five inches square, into which fitted small movable blocks, also of wood, numbered 1, 2, 3, etc., up to 15.

The puzzle consisted in arranging the blocks in order from 1 to 15. It was the most harmless looking affair imaginable; yet, if we are to credit the newspapers of the period, men sat down to it in the greatest confidence and ended in a strait-jacket. Whatever way one started to solve the puzzle everything worked well up to a certain point. The numbers fell into perfect order almost automatically until the last two or last three were reached. The arithmetical progression was perfect up to this point, but when the last three were expected to fall into line and read 13, 14, 15, to the surprise of the solver they read—14, 13, 15. Smiling at his mistake, the performer started anew, when, to his surprise, the end read—13, 15, 14. Somewhat annoyed at his second failure and determined not to be caught napping a third time, he again manipulated the blocks, this time to find the ending, perhaps, 15, 14, 13. Beginning now to realize that there was, perhaps, some difficulty in the puzzle after all, he entered on the solution in dead earnest—perhaps, adopted a new method—only to find the termination was—14, 15, 13. Again and again it was tried with similar results. Every combination seemed to come easily except the regular series, 13, 14, 15; and at last the puzzle was flung aside in despair. What we wish to note particularly here is: First, that the order was always perfect up to a certain point; next, that there were only two or at most three recalcitrant numbers in the end; and, lastly, that with the perfect order of almost the whole, while the two or three recalcitrant numbers remained at the end, no man pretended to claim that he had solved the puzzle.

The evolutionists have a similar problem on their hands; but they do not act quite so rationally. They go over the evolutionary series with natural selection as the key, only to find that the residual phenomena will not fall into line, but end with 15, 14, 13. Encouraged by the perfect arrangement of the rest of the work, they go over the ground again with similar results. They abandon natural selection and start afresh, using the new key of functionally-produced modifications, but end with 14, 13, 15. After a few further attempts—followed always by failure—they try a combination of natural selection and functionally-produced changes as the key, only still to find that residual phenomena will read anything but 13, 14, 15. They have produced beautiful combinations and cannot persuade themselves that such perfect arrangement up to a certain point meant nothing—just as the series in the puzzle runs for a long distance in perfect progression—but the residual phenomena remain, like the numbers at the end, unsolved and insoluble. But while the champion prize-winner who undertakes the puzzle and gets only 14, 13, 15 knows that he has failed and that he would only be laughed at should he claim that he had solved the puzzle, the evolutionist will not admit

that his 15, 14, 13 is failure at all. He insists that his beautiful combinations must count for something; that, in fact, he has solved the problem. This is what we are told is a demonstrated conclusion in science.

We may be all anxious to become evolutionists provided the evidence will permit us. But here it is manifestly a question of believing not only in spite of the evidence, but in spite of the admission that the evidence is false. To believe a wrong doctrine which we imagine to be right may be only an error of perception; but to persist in believing a doctrine which we admit to be false is against good morals. Shall it be said that we are not asked to do this? Then let us put it to the test. Does the evidence show that evolution by means of natural selection is the law of nature? No. On the contrary, it has been demonstrated to be false. The few who will not yet admit it to be false are forced to admit—what is the same thing—that it is defective. Does the evidence show that evolution by means of functionally-produced modifications is the law of nature? No. On the contrary, all Darwinians and all Spencerians admit its insufficiency. Does the evidence show that evolution by means of natural selection and functionally-produced modifications combined is the law of nature? Darwinians and some others ridicule the notion as absurd. Mr. Spencer maintains that with the exception of some classes of phenomena which we may here call the 13, 14, 15 of phenomena, it is all-sufficient; which is equivalent to saying that it is manifestly insufficient.

As Mr. Spencer, however, is still the highest authority on evolution, let us glance briefly at the workings of the combined factors in the realm over which Mr. Spencer claims the allied forces have sway. Formerly he deemed one factor sufficient to account for all phenomena; now we are told three are required. Some phenomena, we are told, are inexplicable otherwise than by natural selection; some can be explained only by the inheritance of functionally-produced changes; while other some still are explicable only by the aid of the primordial factor—the direct action of the medium. But the question naturally arises: What are the respective duties of these three factors? What relations do the factors themselves bear to one another? Are they three separate, independent sovereigns? Do they reign conjointly, consecutively or distributively? Are we to regard the world of evolution as a region ruled over by a triumvirate which, like Cæsar, Crassus and Pompey, partition among themselves the organic, possibly the inorganic world also? Or is it an ideal republic—a new Utopia—where there are only three possible candidates for the presidency, and where, by some new felicitous arrangement, each candidate reaches the presidential chair at the

VOL. XXVI—11

proper time without the time-honored campaign courtesies, the pledging of the spoils of office, or even the traditional ceremony of purchasing votes? Some phenomena, we are told, have their explanation in one factor, some in a second, some in a third, while others some seem to have their explanation in a combination of two or even all three of the factors; but whether all three exercise a joint sovereignty or whether each has its own independent sphere within which the other two would be regarded as intruders; or whether each reigns for a fixed period, handing over his sceptre to the next; or whether natural selection, the inheritance of functionally-produced modifications and the direct action of the medium are, like Mrs. Malaprop's Cerberus, simply "three gentlemen at once;" is what neither Mr. Spencer, Mr. Darwin nor any of their followers has succeeded in satisfactorily explaining. Coöperation can hardly have been the rule that has been followed, for if we take Mr. Spencer's word for it, he will point out to us whole realms where he avers that natural selection has been the sole exclusive factor, while on the other hand he will show us numerous instances in which it must be wholly excluded as a factor. And the same reasons will militate against any theory of consecutiveness or distribution of empire.

Indeed, there are few things more amusing than Mr. Spencer's well-meant efforts to effect a balance of power between the various factors. The assignment of their different provinces to those ambitious factors and the prevention of mutual encroachments has been a sore trial to Mr. Spencer; and he has not always succeeded to his own satisfaction. If it be true that "uneasy lies the head that wears a crown," Mr. Spencer could truthfully assert, from his own experience, that still more uneasy lies the head whose task is to maintain the proper limits of each of many crowns, and to keep its own proper crown on each particular head. Mr. Spencer's experience is that there is liable to be a confusion of territories as well as a confounding of diadems. Take, for instance, natural selection. Mr. Spencer at first made it sole and absolute ruler, with sovereign, undisputed sway on land and sea throughout all time, past, present and future. Its empire was the universe. But now all this is changed. Old age grows apace on the once proud monarch. A new and active world which it has brought into being springs up around it, so progressive and so intricately complicated that natural selection is no longer able to keep pace with the times. From the very outset it was merely a plodder, and now in "the multiplicity of directly-coöperative organs" and "the multiplicity of organs which do not coöperate," except in a certain way, natural selection, while not yet a hindrance, shows unmistakable symptoms of its inability to march in the van of progress.

"Where the life is simple," Mr. Spencer tells us, "or where circumstances render some one function supremely important, survival of the fittest may readily bring about the appropriate structural change."

But here began and ended its usefulness. Mr. Spencer somewhat regretfully adds:

"But in proportion as the life grows complex—in proportion as a healthy existence cannot be secured by a large endowment of some one power, but demands many powers—in the same proportion do there arise obstacles to the increase of any particular power by the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life."—(Natural Selection.)

And Mr. Spencer, as if insisting on the abdication of natural selection, repeats his remarks, regretfully indeed, but firmly.

"As fast," he says, "as the number of bodily and mental faculties increases and as fast as maintenance of life comes to depend less on the amount of any one and more on the combined actions of all, so fast does the production of specialties of character by natural selection alone become difficult. Particularly does this seem to be so with a species so multitudinous in its powers as mankind; and above all does it seem to be so with such of the human powers as have but minor shares in aiding the struggle for life—the æsthetic faculties, for example."

It may be remarked in passing that thus does Mr. Spencer at one fell stroke despoil natural selection of its long-vaunted honor of producing a race of men on this planet. Man is too fearfully and wonderfully made, Mr. Spencer informs us, to be the product of natural selection; and that doctrine he gently but firmly relegates to the region which, for want of a better name, is called in common parlance "fossil," "back number," "has been" and such like. No sooner, however, has the dethronement taken place than Mr. Spencer, conscience-smitten for an act which was surely imperative, finds the bowels of his compassion moved in favor of the discrowned ruler; and lest natural selection should feel too sorely aggrieved over its degradation he hastens to assure it that it must not regard itself as altogether useless. No; no! No such thing. The dethroned and degraded doctrine is yet good for something. Quite touchingly he tells us:

"It by no means follows that in cases of this kind natural selection plays no part. Wherever it is not the chief agent in working organic changes it is still, very generally, the secondary agent."

But, alas! even for this place, second though it be, Mr. Spencer evidently finds the dethroned doctrine incompetent. In the advancing cycles, and rapid changes, and increasing complexity of things natural selection is but a laggard, and Mr. Spencer is forced at last to deal with it after the manner of all incapables. He drops it altogether. In a quasi aside he tells us "there are, however, some modifications in the sizes and forms of parts *which cannot have been aided by natural selection.*" It was inevitable. *Facilis descensus Averni.* The degraded chieftain is now despised and dropped entirely out of sight. Still this dismissal

does not rest easy on Mr. Spencer's conscience. The ghost of natural selection evidently haunts Mr. Spencer's waking thoughts and walks uneasy in his dreams. Like Banquo's, it will not down. Natural selection too long loomed up majestically in the evolutionary heavens to submit easily to so ignominious a dismissal, and Mr. Spencer is forced again to recognize its claims. Mr. Spencer is at his wit's ends to find an appropriate office to which he can assign it, and feeling guilty at heart because of his shabby treatment of the once potent factor, he hastens to soothe the outraged feelings of the deposed sovereign. What wonder then that in his confusion he should forget what he told us a moment before, and that almost before the words had died away on his lips in which he told us of the instances in which natural selection was a complete supernumerary, he reassures that doctrine that: To be sure—to be sure—

"Always there must have been, and always there must continue to be, a survival of the fittest; natural selection must have been in operation at the outset, and can never cease to operate."

But now that Mr. Spencer has reinstated in its claims natural selection, the question comes, what shall be done with it? Indeed to Mr. Spencer the question, what shall we do with our ex-factors? is quite as perplexing as is to us the question, what shall we do with our ex-Presidents? And here it is that Mr. Spencer executes a *coup* which proves him to be alike a brilliant statesman and an unflinching friend. It was, indeed, somewhat awkward to have natural selection stalk back again into court and assert its claims when it was confidently believed that both claims and owner had been got rid of forever; but Mr. Spencer was equal to the occasion. He promptly established for its special benefit an entirely new office, that of headsman of the kingdom of evolution; and natural selection was promptly installed as general fool-killer of the realm. Here is the statute creating the office, and by virtue of which natural selection was duly inaugurated. (The inconsequence of thought and incoherence of language are unusual with Mr. Spencer, and only serve to show the perturbed condition of Mr. Spencer's mind.) It reads:

"The production of adaptations by direct equilibration then takes the first place, indirect equilibration serving to facilitate it. Until at length, among the civilized races, the equilibrium becomes mainly direct, the action of natural selection being limited to the destruction of those who are constitutionally too feeble to live, even with external aid."

One would naturally suppose that such an office was a perfect sinecure. It would require the genius of Mr. Spencer to determine precisely just what amount of energy was needed to kill off those who could not live, even when externally aided. Assuredly neither the strength of a Samson nor the power of a Hercules was required to fulfil the duties of Lord High Executioner. And yet it must be confessed on looking over the field of evolution that the

office is but indifferently administered, and that here, too, natural selection shows itself to be a delinquent functionary. But that is neither here nor there. The main point which we must not lose sight of is Mr. Spencer's almost insurmountable difficulties in maintaining intact his inter-factorial arrangements. Nor is this all. It must be remembered that all these difficulties confronted him in times of comparative peace. What, then, in time of warfare? For we must not forget that the dethroned monarch, natural selection, has, if not a powerful, at least a noisy following, and that its followers insist on nothing less than a restoration of the dethroned factor to all its original dignities and prerogatives—a movement which, knowing as he does the utter incapacity of natural selection—Mr. Spencer feels it his bounden duty to strenuously oppose. And if in the *mêlée* Mr. Spencer is forced from time to time to sacrifice his humane and philanthropic intentions in behalf of his old friend to his sense of right, and even to deal that friend a somewhat rough blow now and then, the fault is not Mr. Spencer's, but theirs who will persist in forcing natural selection upon him in spite of its demonstrated incapacity.

We have here indicated in brief some of the difficulties of a divided factorship, roughly outlining Mr. Spencer's perplexity in assigning its province to natural selection. Natural selection, however, is but one single factor; and Mr. Spencer has not one, but three, upon whose discordant claims he is called upon to arbitrate. And as the claims of some of the others are as fiercely contested as those of natural selection are urged, Mr. Spencer's lot as general adjuster is anything but a happy one.

And this is the doctrine, demoralized beyond all understanding, to which we are asked to subscribe. As it stands before the world to-day it bears rather the imprint of bedlam than that of science, logic or reason.

But we are told Catholic scientists accept the doctrine of evolution. They all agree that evolution is a fact. That they do so is not at all impossible or even improbable. The ovine instinct is, undoubtedly, as strong in the Catholic scientist as in any other. But without intending any disrespect to Catholic scientists, it might be safe to ask them where are the proofs of the doctrine? Infidel and materialistic scientists admit that the evidence has broken down; possibly Catholic scientists have been more fortunate. If so, the world would be pleased to see the proofs. We are all willing to become evolutionists when we are convinced of the truth of the doctrine; but we maintain that until the proofs are forthcoming it would be immoral to accept it. We are somewhat loath to accept the doctrine on the mere word of the scientists, since we have yet to learn that the *con-*

sensus communis of Catholic scientists has been established as a new criterion of certitude. We further know that evolutionists were fully as certain and fully as dogmatic twenty years ago in their teachings that evolution *by means of natural selection* was a fact as they are to-day that evolution is a fact. But if evolution is a fact, may it not be legitimately asked, evolution of what kind? Is it the evolution of the Darwinian? or the evolution of the Neo-Darwinian? or the evolution of the Spencerian? or the evolution of the Neo-Lamarckian? If any, which of them, and what are the proofs? It will not do to say that evolution is true; because evolution without some key to unlock it conveys no meaning. It is as intelligible as the signals which Professor Tesla tells us he is receiving from Mars. This much at least could be said for those who followed the dogmatism in vogue a quarter of a century ago: False as was that dogmatism, it masqueraded as truth. The evangelists of the doctrine professed faith in their own teachings; now, however, they admit the inadequacy of their doctrines. Yet, strange to say, the disciples multiply as the evidence weakens. Formerly we believed because of an inadequate evidence which we falsely supposed to be adequate. Now we believe in spite of the fact that the evidence has been proved and is admitted to be inadequate. It cannot, however, be regarded either as sound philosophy or as sound morals to change our *credo quia impossibile est* to a *credo quia falsum est*.

S. FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

LUTHER AND HIS PROTESTANT BIOGRAPHERS.

IF Emerson's hackneyed and jaded axiom that "there is properly no history, only biography," is not a meaningless platitude, and conceals a bare substratum of truth, a fact that may be presumptively entertained, if not tacitly admitted, then every student of history must join the increasingly large and vehemently insistent chorus which demands a new life of Martin Luther. Confessedly one of the most conspicuous figures in the life of Germany, one of the epoch-creating minds in the history of religious thought, one of the most potent agencies in the political trend of modern nations, whether for weal or woe, remains an open, arguable, stubbornly contested controversy—his career in many of its diversified workings

stands without an authentic, trustworthy chronicle. A Colossus, whom the popular mind represents as bestriding the two most crucial epochs in history since the dawn of Christianity—the Middle Ages and the Renaissance—beaconing aloft the new light which should dispel religious and intellectual darkness: a Titan whose dominant will, infectious eloquence and unbridled impulsiveness diverted a large part of Northern and Western Europe from the stream of a sixteen-centuried, unbroken current—he still awaits the advent of the critical, scientific biographer. Not that assiduous efforts in this direction have not been made, or that abundant results are not in evidence. The Luther biographical literature is cumbered and weighted down with the luxuriant fertility and tireless industry of the last three centuries. But the success of these endeavors is not always commensurate with the opportunities. Reverential tenderness, hagiologic unctuousness, pietistic exaltation and indurated credulity, overstrained panegyric and grandiose rhetoric are keyed in their highest pitch when they have Luther as a theme.

In almost every instance the biographer seems struck with a sense of awe and infinitude when he applies his critical rule to the Reformer. He discovers nothing but immeasurable heights or unfathomable depths. There are no depressions or elevations, no low-lying country and mountain peaks, no gullies and ravines, no defiles and cliffs and escarpments. With compass and sounding line he is stupefied with wonderment at the prospect of an

Illimitable ocean, without bound,
Without dimension, where length, breadth and height
And time and place are lost.

He forgets to make even an endeavor to take his correct bearings.

But in this farrago of flattery and pedantry we search in vain for distinctness and completeness of the Reformer's personality. The clearly etched lineaments of the man of flesh and blood, the man of moods and impulses, of angularities and idiosyncrasies—in the fullness of his stature, the maturity of his work, the results of his mission—is slighted and ignored. It is seemingly overlooked that "the Old Adam in Martin Luther . . . was a very formidable personage; lodged in a body of surpassing vigour, solicited by vehement appetites and alive to all the passions by which man is armed for offensive and defensive warfare with his fellows."¹ The veil shrouding his sacrosanct person is not lifted; he is not taken from the incense laden altar of hero-worship, "that ditch of prehistoric prejudice," to submit to the scrutiny of criticism's piercing searchlight, psychology's subtle analysis, logic's inflexible canons. The mythical hero

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 68, p. 276.

Luther has been fully exploited; the historical *man* Luther awaits disinterment.

Nietzsche, one of the ripest developments of modern German intellectualism, speaks of an "*Umwertung der Goethe'schen Werte*," "re-appraisal of the Goethe values," which is now rudely shaking the Weimar prophet on his Parnassian heights. No student, historical, political or theological, can blind himself to the fact that for well nigh a century there has been among Protestant scholars an insurrectionary movement, with bated breath at times, mutinous intractability at others, but always active and mordant as an acid, inciting a re-appraisal of the Luther values. His greatness was taken on trust. A more observant and critical, less credulous and reverent posterity is now scanning the Reformation period, and conjointly Luther. Both may be taken as convertible terms, for, as Professor Baumgartner comprehensively puts it, "to study the Reformation is to study Luther;" and he sounds a keynote when he adds that it is because Luther is insufficiently studied that a veil covers the history of the Reformation.²

The result of this movement is already apparent. The fictions and chimeras are gradually melting away like dissolving views from the historical horizon. In this hegira from the borderland of historical obscurity to the noonday of truth, the Reformation has changed its entire character and aspect. Luther is a star wavering in its orbit; the nimbus circling his brow emits an unsteady, paling light. The *man* Luther is brought from the twilight of the gods to the tribunal of calm, critical scrutiny. The adventitious appendages stripped off, the glamour of devoutly woven romance dissipated, the solid core of his being laid bare, the undazzled eye of philosophic criticism reveals an entirely new character, discloses startling results and unravels unaccounted motives. In fact, the new Reformation studies have effected a veritable metamorphosis, a metamorphosis that forms not a mere incident or episode, but, to use the words of a weighty English critical review, "marks an epoch in the progress of historical scholarship."³

The first rude shock the Luther myth received was when Bossuet revealed the Reformer as a theologian⁴ in a work which Brunetière pronounces the greatest historical monument of the last centuries,⁵ and Buckle designates as "the most formidable work ever directed against Protestantism."⁶ Here in dealing with Luther, says Hallam, "the eagle of Meaux is . . . truly seen, lordly of form, fierce of eye, terrible in his beak and claws." Yet aside of his incomparable eloquence, luminous perspicuity, ardent sincerity, his whole

² "Luther Redivivus," p. 115. ³ *Athenæum*, Dec., 1884, p. 729. ⁴ "History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches," 2 vols. ⁵ *The Bookman*, Vol. V., p. 26. ⁶ "History of Civilization in England," Vol. I., p. 560.

strength lies in his perfect mastery of the Reformer's works, which were then as little known as they are now. An intuitive prescience told the historian, Catholic and Protestant, long ago that when students "find, as assuredly they will find, when some Roman Catholic historian chooses to lift a corner of the veil that has hitherto concealed the fanaticism of the reformers how carefully the view has been closed by Protestant historians,"⁷ disillusion, if not bitter resentment, will be the penalty. Bossuet lifted a corner of the veil, showed us Luther as a theologian, his doctrinal system with its contradictions, paradoxes, vacillations, inconsistencies, rhetorical artifices, in a light that has not been dimmed, much less obscured, to this day. This was the first rift in the Reformation fabric, long known to exist, but now first publicly disclosed.

Then came Döllinger,⁸ rivetting the attention of scholarship on the inner development of the Reformation, with Luther again as a pivotal figure. In this work, remarkable for its penetrative vision, constructive skill, logical coherence and unwearied research, with deft hand and passionless speech, he probes Luther and his work to the very hilt. His terrible surgery of the Reformation dissects and anatomizes its every organ, tissue, nerve centre; lays open its most hidden processes, auscultates its feeblest heartbeats, gives articulation to its inarticulate speech. This he does with such a photographic fidelity and microscopic minuteness and unerring divination, such an accuracy, definiteness and trustworthiness of statement, the Reformers themselves giving their evidence in their own words, that the work remains to this day an unanswered and unanswerable monument of German objectivity, industry and erudition.⁹ What Schliemann did for Troy and Tiryus, Döllinger did for the Reformation. The work was at once a prophecy and a fulfilment.

With the fatal breach widened, it only needed a Janssen,¹⁰ with his careful analysis, patient investigation, cautious inference, guarded statement and a matchless architectonic skill that might be called genius, to blaze like a pillar of fire into the full domain of the German Reformation, dissipating its foggy mistiness and tearing away the whole mythical toggery which screened it from the eyes of honest thinkers. The first discharge of his well directed artillery, "with its new material, its careful selection, its width of grasp, its

⁷ *Athenæum*, 1836, p. 271. ⁸ "Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung," etc., 3 vols. Regensburg, 1846. ⁹ "The fear inspiring book of Döllinger on the Reformation," says the Protestant Professor Nippold, himself a Reformation specialist, "which develops the thesis with an unapproachable knowledge of original sources, that all the Reformers were obliged to look back upon the fruit of their work with sorrow, [a historian] who has searched hundreds of contemporary writers, a whole array of forgotten names, in whose bearers we have since rediscovered important factors of the Reformation, when and where was the work ever controverted?" *Deutsch-erang. Blätter*, 1881, p. 631. ¹⁰ "Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes," 8 vols. Freiburg.

essentially popular character,"¹¹ laid prostrate the whole disorderly and panic-stricken squadron of legends and myths. His "crushing examination of the Luther myth" are the significant words of one of the foremost English Protestant critical journals "produced a tremendous uproar in Germany. . . . It called at once Ebrard, Köstlin, Kawerau and a host of minor disputants in the field. . . . It reached its climax in the foundation of the 'Verein für Reformationsgeschichte,' which may shortly be described as a society for the suppression of Janssen and the perpetuation of the Luther myth."¹²

The last step from the twilight of fable to the dawn of historical truth was at length taken. The attitude of Catholic historical writing was changed from the defensive to the offensive. The whole structure of German Reformation history must undergo a radical change, rehabilitation and restoration, and that, moreover, from foundation base to tower finial. Incident to the changed attitude are the cognate difficulties that affect the very existence of the Reformation, go to its very root, and which find themselves voiced in the queries of Professor Karl Pearson: "Possibly Northern Europe took a wrong step at that time; possibly the Reformation was the outcome of passion rather than of reason; possibly more good was destroyed than evil reformed"¹³—queries that not only clamor for solution, but are in the nature of an historic portent.

It is not to be inferred that Bossuet, Döllinger and Janssen were the first argonauts to set sail in quest of the historical treasure-trove buried in library, fading in manuscript or doomed to designed obscurity, that they published what was unknown and unavailable. "That the ordinary account of the Reformation and Luther" is the well-founded declaration of a reviewer already quoted, "to be found in the works of a certain class of Protestant theologians is purely mythical was a fact undoubtedly known to those historical students who had investigated the period at first hand."¹⁴ But why not make this knowledge accessible to the common reader; why maintain a mystification about data which must and will come to light? Here it is where we find the heroism of the Catholic authors fully revealed and the sacred cause of historic truth championed. They garnered the whole harvest to the inclusion of every stray ear worth gleaning. They purged the historic accumulation of its dross and slag. They waited in weary patience until the perturbed, murky stream de-

¹¹ *Athenæum*, Dec., 1884, p. 729. ¹² *Ib.* . . . "It as far surpasses Von Ranke's 'History of Germany at the Time of the Reformation,'" continues the same authority, "as the latter book itself threw historians of the calibre of Menzel in the shade." No less significant are the words of the great German historiographer Georg Waitz, maintaining that "Janssen is at present the first of living historians." This said in the lifetime of Von Ranke points its own moral. "Jahresbericht der Görres Gesellschaft" für 1891, p. 22. The fact that Janssen is now in his eighteenth edition and Von Ranke in his sixth, though published in 1830-1847, shows popular appreciation as well as scholarly recognition. ¹³ *Athenæum*, Oct., 1883, p. 530. ¹⁴ *Athenæum*, 1884, p. 729.

posited its sediment at the bottom. Then they gave their results broadcast to the world, and in spite of howling zealotry and national fury gained a victory, they still claim, by the indefeasible rights of honest, legitimate and well earned conquest.

Keen scented, indefatigably plodding German scholarship was long aware of this hived wealth. But it likewise knew that the concealment of this wealth insured the security of the legends and prestige of the Reformation. Instinctively it felt that the promiscuous publication of this suppressed evidence would be the opening of a veritable Pandora's box, create a national ferment, a religious upheaval, an explosion of sectarian wrath. In spite of the Scriptural injunction applauding the pursuit of "whatever things are just and whatever things are true," a fatuous blindness mistaken for patriotism, a shrinking timidity to oppose single handed a century-rooted tradition, an involuntary reluctance to take the initiative in dethroning a popular deity, dwarfing a religious hero, unmasking a national saint, were not subjects of comforting contemplation. Besides, what would be gained in lifting the magic spell, the poetic romanticism that enthralled the German mind and make it voice its elegiac grief in the words of its Schiller:

Die alten Fabelwesen sind nicht mehr;
Das reizende Geschlecht ist ausgewandert?¹⁵

A dim recollection of Socrates and hemlock, of Protagoras and exile, of the Damoclean sword forged in the heated fires of Augsburg—*cujus regio, illius religio*—may somewhat have shaken its pedantic stoicism. It was said of Dr. Johnson that he started in life with his fagot of opinions made up, and felt that whoever drew out a single stick weakened the whole. German tradition and nationality have their bundle of fagots, "have certain hereditary landmarks," as Lord Acton puts it, "not good to disturb, certain names too closely associated with national glory to be exposed to profanation. Luther," he continues, "is one of them, and Frederic and Goethe."¹⁶

The German mind was fed and nourished, became imbued and permeated with the idea that the Reformation was a divine fact in history; its birth signalized by a second Pentecostal outpouring; the instruments employed elect vessels of supernal wisdom, angelic purity, seraphic ardor, untinged by worldliness, unaffected by passion, with no human, sordid motive discoverable. This was an article of faith—the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*. With a unique positiveness of logic and superlativeness of rhetoric, always driving a furious pen, the Mythopœic Oligarchy never swayed until forci-

¹⁵ The dear old fables no longer exist;
The charming race has left us.

¹⁶ *English Historical Review*, Vol. I., p. 14.

bly driven from this fallacious position. He who would call in question the attributes of the Reformers or deny the divine mission of the Reformation placed his lever and wedge at the very foundation of Protestantism and Nationalism. He was alike traitor and apostate, disloyal to his country, blasphemous to its creed. Planck, the first and probably greatest historian of the Protestant doctrinal system, even during the last century laments that "that historical writing was branded with sacrilege which had the temerity merely to touch upon the faults of our Reformers."¹⁷ "We Protestants," is the statement of a semi-official State publication, "are reared and nursed, as is well known, in a hatred of Papacy and in unquestioning reverence for Luther and Lutheranism. He who attacks it violates our holiest sensibilities. Even should he in single instances have right, we revolt against him and will simply not tolerate it."¹⁸ National vanity more than religious sincerity or love of truth seems to motive the unwritten Draconian law which threatens inevitable shipwreck to the historian who must steer between the Scylla of Goethe's "poetry is the only form of truth" and the Charybdis of Von Sybel's "the historian must first be a patriot."

The biographic lacuna, as far as the critical history of Luther is concerned, becomes all the more obtrusively patent in view of the fact that few, if any single character, since the close of the Middle Ages affords more autobiographic, plastic, dramatic elements and data. Luther was no taciturn, self-absorbed misanthrope; no solitary, self-communing spirit. No one ever paid a more contemptuous heed to the golden maxim,

Give thy thoughts no tongue,
Nor any unproportioned thought his act.

No one ever treated with more flagrant disregard his own chosen maxim, *in silentio et spe erit fortitudo vestra*. He was not only a man of strong passions, unbending spirit, violent temper, of irregular, wayward and undisciplined will, of insurgent, radical originality, of half-formed, ever changing theories, of continually excited nerves and seething blood, but of a most blunt, fearless, brutal frankness. Morley tells us, and the *mot* is really most happy, that Carlyle compressed the Gospel of the Eternal Silence into thirty handsome volumes. Luther, who never claimed the Nirvana of silence, expanded the Gospel of Unfettered Speech into a voluminousness of library proportions. Of no man can it be more infallibly declared that "*le style c'est l'homme*;" in no man do we find the paramountcy of the personal equation more accentuated. He was fearless to the border of irresponsible rashness, blunt to the exclusion of every quail of delicacy, audacious to the scorn of every magnanimous restraint,

¹⁷ "Geschichte des Protestantischen Lehrbegriffs," Vol. I., p. 16. ¹⁸ *Deutsche Jahrbücher*, 1841, p. 514.

coarse beyond the power of reproducible Anglo-Saxon, lubricous to a degree that even pales Rabelaisian foulness. His was a volcanic, torrential personality. Like the eagle, he disported himself in the tempest; like the stormy petrel, he found joy in breasting the storm. He loved the blare of trumpets, the clash of arms, the din of war, the howl of embattled hosts. Even in moments of repose and tranquillity he was, to use Byron's apt illustration, a

"Slumbering earthquake pillowed on fire."

Yet blended with all these conflicting elements we discover momentary flashes of a contemplative mysticism fairly steeped in the spirit of the *Imitatio Christi*; our hearts are thrilled by occasional sublimities of a spiritual utterance that rival the most inspirational moments of the great Christian pulpit orators; glimpses of a haunting spirituality, outbursts of a sweet human tenderness strike us that are more like reflections and refrains from Assisi than the inspirations of Wittenberg.

Here we have a biographic composite, the fusion of which forms at once the delight and embarrassment, the ambition and discomfiture, the hope and despair of the historiographer.

Let us see how Protestant scholarship met this vexatious problem, first in England and America, and then in Germany.

More than eighty years ago Coleridge, probably the first Englishman to inoculate Great Britain with German thought, with that critical perception that seldom forsakes him, expresses his regret that "a life of the man Luther as well as Luther the theologian is still a desideratum in English literature, though perhaps there is no subject for which so many unused materials are extant, both printed and in manuscript."¹⁹ Coleridge's infatuation for the German Reformer was only inferior to that of his quondam disciple Carlyle. His rare philosophic intuitions, however, evaded the task and peril of writing the Reformer's life, a pitfall into which the Sage of Ecclefechan incontinently fell. How the Prophet of the Eternal Verities felt when he heard Coleridge apostrophize Luther, "Yes, heroic swan, I love thee even when thou gablest like a goose;"²⁰ or when with philosophic composure he epigrammatically tells us "even in Luther's lowest imbecilities what gleams of a vigorous sense;"²¹ or when hopelessly entangled in Luther's ever recurring paradoxes and inanities, "heaving the gentle misery of a sigh," to use his own words, he lays aside his book with the despairing confession, "O swan, thy cygnets are but goslings,"²² Froude for once fails to chronicle. To the present day the desideratum has not been filled in the

¹⁹ "Complete Works," Vol. II., p. 126. New York, 1858. ²⁰ "Works," Vol. V., p. 301. ²¹ *Ib.* ²² *Ib.*, 298.

English tongue, and as we will presently see, most unsatisfactorily and uncritically in the German.

D'Aubigné's translated work²³ was for a long time, and among the uncultured is yet, the source from which the English reading public drew its knowledge of Luther. His historical methods are the subject of a crushing review by Maitland.²⁴ He is "a Protestant of the original stamp" is the estimate of the *Edinburgh Review*,²⁵ "and a biographer of the old fashion, not a calm, candid, discriminating weigher and measurer of a great man's parts, but a warm-hearted champion of his glory and a resolute apologist even of his errors," . . . and continues the same writer, "he is no mean proficient in that art which reaches to perfection only in the Drama and Romance." He "is always coloring," says Mozley in his masterly essay on Luther, "and will let nothing speak for itself. . . . If the historian has no remark to make the preacher has, and the reader, harassed with an endless reiteration of small reflections and officious instructions, retaliates by regarding M. D'Aubigné as a writer a good deal more copious than weighty. His omissions in the line of fact are nearly as large, moreover, as his additions in the way of comment . . . A lively and pointed style" is his conclusion, "but he is a thoroughgoing partisan."²⁶

Michelet, the French skeptic, whose religious creed Saintsbury tells us was "a mixture of sentimentalism, communism and anti-sacerdotalism," and whose violent anti-Catholic propaganda while occupying the chair of history in the College de France gave him an international notoriety, likewise gave us a life of Luther.²⁷ This work, written with much literary charm and emanating ostensibly from a Catholic, enjoyed a large popularity. It "hardly professes to be more than a crude and struggling performance, its composition having been the amusement of the writer during an illness. It consists principally" (we are quoting Mozley) "of passages strung together from the table talk and those parts of Luther's writings where the Reformer speaks of himself. . . . An admiration of Luther's greatness, sympathy with his genial flow of spirits and amusement at his faults and extravagances compose . . . the feeling of the impartial biographer toward his hero, and the skeptic seems to gaze with quiet pleasure upon the medley which the religious leader, saint and prophet of so many millions of Christians exhibits."²⁸ "There is but one French historian of the first class," writes a reviewer in the *Literary-Era*, "who distorts incidents and misreads

²³ "History of the Great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in Germany, Switzerland," etc. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné. Vols. I.-III. London, 1838.

²⁴ "The Dark Ages," p. 540 et seq. London, 1890. ²⁵ Vol. 68, pp. 314-315.

²⁶ "Essays, Historical and Theological," p. 322. ²⁷ "Life of Luther," etc., translated by Hazlitt, 1846. ²⁸ Mozley, ut sup., p. 323.

documents to establish a theory—Michelet. He owns frankly, however, that he is partial; he believed from the marrow of his soul that Catholicism had blighted the fair promise of the 'Reformation' in France, and he forced every evidence and incident to corroborate his *parti-pris*." Critically it has no more historical value than Diedrich Knickerbocker's "History of New York."

Following D'Aubigné and Michelet, Carlyle gave us his Dorésque prose-epic,²⁹ a work which he himself in his "Reminiscences" classifies as "a detestable piece of prophecy and play-actorism." His morbid and melancholy introspectiveness is here flamboyantly displayed in the same lurid phrase-coining, extravagance of diction, over effusiveness of sentiment, platitudinous banalities which make his writings more bizarre than lucid, more picturesque than reliable. As far as the Catholic Church is concerned, Carlyle was congenitally handicapped by a refracting mind, one acting like water, which causes the straightest rod placed in it to appear bent and crooked. His judgment was warped, his vision distorted, his critical faculties dulled, his bile stirred, his language quivering with rage when Catholicism crossed his path. Moreover, as Mozley very pertinently reasons of Carlyle's idiosyncratic "hero-worship," "a *rationale* of heroism was not likely to tell much in English minds," he might have made the statement more generic by including all rational minds "which appealed to Mahomet, Odin, Dante, Knox, Luther, Rousseau, Dr. Johnson and Voltaire as one grand specimen of it, and which seemed to demand a complete intellectual suicide and decomposition in the recipient previous to its reception."³⁰ It was in these essays, according to Goldwin Smith, that Carlyle "set up a worship of force and kindled a spirit of violence totally subversive of the Sermon on the Mount." Again, it is a psychological enigma that has never been adequately explained, whether the reckless irregularity and brilliant wilfulness of a man who calls Guizot "wishy-washy," speaks of his friend Emerson as "talking moonshine," dismisses Hugo as "a glittering humbug," characterizes Newman as destitute of "the intellect of a moderate sized rabbit" and spits his venom at one of the sweetest of modern hymnologists as that "little ape called Keble," is not after all a cross between Cato and Punch; whether a prophet who in Holmes' characterization lives "with half his self-consciousness habitually centred beneath his diaphragm" is a qualified judge to give in his dyspeptic croakings a rational, just estimate of even his stable boy. No wonder "his friends sighed in silence" over the monograph which neither added to the hero's grandeur, contributed to the author's fame, enlarged mankind's knowledge or strengthened history's sanctity.

²⁹ "Lecture on Heroes and Hero Worship." ³⁰ Mozley, *ut sup.*, p. 229.

Next in order, both chronologically and in the range and extent of its circulation, is the biography issued under the ægis of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*,³¹ by Professor T. M. Lindsay. The sponsorship of the great international work gives this sophomoric effort an accessibility and authority which under the most favorable conditions it could not otherwise obtain. The article is marked by an absence of original research, historic accuracy and literary distinction. It bristles with such a mass of stalking, even ludicrous blunders that a sheer sense of self-respect compelled the American publishers to issue a supplemental postscript correcting the more egregious ones. How a historian ignorant of the elementary knowledge of a language can have the courage, or rather rashness, to deal with the idiomatic plasticity, colloquial terseness, brawny vigor, coruscating invective and cyclonic sweep of Luther's cyclopean German is hard to understand. Yet here we have an historian of accredited reputation, in one of the most erudite works in the language, translate Luther's truculent letter, "*Wider die mörderischen und räuberischen Rotten der Bauern*" (Against the murderous and pillaging rabble of Peasants), "Against the murdering, robbing *rats* of Peasants!"³²

The large work by Bayne³³ is of no conceptional originality, being slavishly Carlylean in method, diction and garrulous egotism. We do not proceed far in the work, however, before we discover that Carlyle's strength is Bayne's weakness, for no matter if the former's style excites admiration or provokes censure, it at all events always defies imitation. Even making allowance for the flashing gems of originality occasionally illumining its hazy wordiness the work adds nothing to our knowledge of Luther or gives us a more comprehensive estimate of his work. Its vagueness of narrative and lack of consecutiveness, poetical rhapsody and apostrophic interjection, basing as it does the life on a paraphrastic variation of De Wette's letters, while it leaves no clear image on the reader's mind, carries the author to the verge of cheap affectation and fuddled bathos.

The last biography, that of Dr. Jacobs,³⁴ in which the author may have been limited in the full exercise of his opportunities by the scope and intent of the publishers—the biography being one of a series—hardly claims more than a passing notice. While devoid of orthodox fury and theological partisanship, the work bears the marks of a compilation rather than an organic unity. Philologists would probably classify it as agglutinative, in which the author, reluctant

³¹ Vol. XV., p. 75. Ninth ed. ³² The latest biography of Luther is written by Professor Lindsay ("Luther and the German Reformation," *The World's Epoch Makers*. Scribner, 1900.) Age and experience have not improved him, and a condensation of more blunders in the same allotted space can hardly be found. He even gives a wrong date of Luther nailing his theses on the Castle church at Wittenberg! (P. 64.) ³³ "Martin Luther: His Life and Work." By Peter Bayne. 2 vols. London, 1887. ³⁴ "Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation." New York, 1898.

or fearful of sustained, original and independent thought, gives us a dioramic exhibition of conventionally popular scenes pieced together. The retention of a number of exploded myths will be no contributing factor to the dignity or authority of the work. However, it is the most readable and reliable we have thus far touched upon.

As soon as we approach Germany we find ourselves compassed by a stupendous literary productivity dealing with every phase of the Reformer's character and achievements, but, paradoxical as it may seem, we search in vain for a biography which satisfies the demands of modern critical writing. In almost every instance the promise is greater than the performance. The bibliography of Luther alone, even in the last century, filled two goodly volumes,³⁵ to which the following century added another,³⁶ and no doubt the recent centenary celebration superadded another. But the absence of all objective method, critical tone and judicial fairness was, and continues of such a nature, that a restive, rebellious tendency is clearly discernible, and the jarring tones of ominous mutterings and sullen protests charge the atmosphere. German students have become suspicious, even alarmed, about their historical patrimony. Its title had been frequently challenged. Now with the vigorous, well-directed, documentarily authenticated labors of a new school threatening its utter invalidation, they demand the abolition of myth and legend, the menacing ballast that presages disaster. The Heidelberg Professor Holtzmann is not the first to sound the warning note against "a Luther myth, in which theological partisanship and at least unconscious falsification was enlisted." "Long ago" are the pregnant words of an authoritative English review, "long ago Moritz, Arndt and Bunsen complained that Germans knew nothing of the real Luther, but contemplated in his stead a thing of shreds and patches, made up of fragments of truth distorted by modern party spirit; and Weingarten in his edition of Rothe's 'Lectures on Church History'³⁷ anticipates that the history of the Reformation will take quite another form when it comes to be written by men who have really read Luther's writings. In the present state of literature of the Reformation history Luther . . . is the least known writer of the sixteenth century."³⁸

A confirmation of this deprecatory language, which we will presently give, and more yet a cursory survey of the original sources of Luther's life, will impart to these opinions almost the validity of a demonstrable truth and prove that these Cassandra vaticinations are not groundless; that in almost every instance the biographies

³⁵ "Centifolium Lutheranum sive notitia literaria scriptorum omnis generis de Luthero," etc. J. A. Fabricius. 2 vols. Hamb., 1728. ³⁶ Bibliotheca biographica Lutherana," Vogel, 1851. ³⁷ Vol. II., p. 329. ³⁸ *Academy*, March, 1884, p. 197.

are lamentably defective in the substantive elements of historiography; that with few exceptions their positions have been successfully impugned, others partially discredited by archival research, and many more are threatened with condign repudiation when the *Documenta Vaticana* emerge from their seclusion.

The first of the four contemporary biographers of Luther is Melancthon.³⁹ The work is featureless and colorless. It is more the appreciation of an affectionate friend than the foundation for subsequent biographers. Prescinding from the allusive mention it makes that Luther had his autobiography in contemplation,⁴⁰ that his mother recalled the hour and day of his birth to the oblivion of the year, it is barren of all interest and data. One unique incident it relates in all seriousness, that Luther the Reformer was a man habituated to bodily mortification and austere asceticism, "sometimes when in good health going four entire days without eating or drinking," at other times satisfying the cravings of hunger by a frugal repast on a herring and small piece of bread. This information, so irreconcilable with the accepted habits of the Reformer, in such open collision with the epicurean sentiments of his writings, so antagonistic to the natural conception of the apostle of good cheer, whose hedonistic, though perhaps apocryphal "wine, wife and song" maxim forms a prouder heritage of the German people than his whole doctrine of justification, has been wisely abandoned by most subsequent writers.⁴¹

The second published life was that of Mathesius,⁴² a devoted friend and ardent admirer of his hero and a frequent sharer of his proverbial hospitality. Whether a life embraced in a series of seventeen plenarily inspired sermons delivered to an audience mainly composed of rustics and miners (Joachimsthal) during a period of frenzied passion—these sermons, as the author tells us, being not

³⁹ "Die Historie vom Leben und Geschichten des ehrwürdigen Herrn Dr. Martin Luther." The Latin biography appeared in 1546. ⁴⁰ Not inapt are the reflections of a writer in the *Academy* anent this prospective autobiography . . . "it would be perfectly natural to suppose that an imagination [Luther's] which could so far gain the mastery over its possessor as to lead him to believe that he had periodical bodily conflicts with evil spirits would not fail to lend a powerful coloring to his conception of his own pet career, and even to exercise its creative faculty in the shape of definite incident." Jan., 1884, p. 53. ⁴¹ We need only recall the scene in Auerbach's cellar, ("Faust," Part I.), where the national poet places this legend in the mouth of Brant:

Es war eine Ratt'im Kellernest,
Lebt nur von Speck und Butter,
Hatt sich ein Ränzlein, angemäast
Als wie der Doctor Luther.

Once in a cellar lived a rat,
He feasted there on butter;
Until his paunch became so fat
As that of Doctor Luther.

⁴² "Anfang, Leben, Lehr, Bekenntniss und seligen Abschied Martini Lutheri," 1565.

"a mere history, but also a consolation, a doctrine and counsel"—whether such a vehicle is the best for the transmission of authentic history is, to say the least, problematical and hazardous. Döllinger, quoting him, tells us that this worthy divine made it his mission "above all things to preach ag. inst the Papists and fearlessly expose their wickedness."⁴³ . . . "Our old friend Mathesius" is the comment of Bayne, "the prattling, credulous man who so dearly prized any semblance of miracle in relation to his adored friend"—"whose sincere affection for Luther engages us in his favor, but who is intellectually a child."⁴⁴ Every page gives evidence that the author unflinchingly carried out his mission, and at the same time proves Bayne a man of phenomenal perspicacity. Mathesius is the *fons et origo* of the discredited incident of Luther's "chancing upon the Latin Bible, which before during his lifetime he had never seen," and with infantile ingenuousness tells us in the same sermon that before the Reformer took his monastic vows (1506) "the convent at his solicitation presents him with a Latin Bible, which he reads with the greatest earnestness and prayerfulness and of which he memorizes much."⁴⁵ He is likewise the author of that climacteric episode where Luther hurls defiance at the Diet of Worms, "Here I stand," etc., now tottering on its unstable feet and abandoned by honest Lutheran scholars. "He prattles about the prophecies that announced Luther's birth."⁴⁶ Such a thing as eccentric vicissitudes, inconsistent passions, capricious anomalies in the life of his hero fall outside of his purview, while the satiric levity of his tongue in assailing the Papacy admirably displays his sense of historical equity and philosophical detachment.

In 1718 Ernest Solomon Cyprian discovered and published the manuscripts of the two remaining contemporary biographers of Luther, which, strange to say, lay buried for a hundred and fifty years. Myconius⁴⁷ and Spalatin⁴⁸ are cognate and coequal spirits. Both have an intellectual affinity with their predecessors; with uncritical docility, though considerable variation of narrative, they pursue the same historical methods. We hardly look, nor do we expect, a balanced adjustment of historical perception, and Carlyle's "piercing radiance of a most subtle insight" in worshipping, incense-wafting devotees.

What the twelve tables and the pontifical college, with its augurs and flamens, were to the devout Roman, these four biographic columns and their gradually surrounding peristyles were to the devout Protestant. But what if these columns are discovered to be fundamentally unsound and morally out of plumb, for columns, like men,

⁴³ "Die Reformation," Vol. II., p. 127. ⁴⁴ Bayne, *ut sup.*, Vol. II., pp. 66, 304. ⁴⁵ "Leben," etc. Neanders ed.—8, pp. 7-9. ⁴⁶ Bayne, *ut sup.*, p. 66. ⁴⁷ Frederici Myconii, "Historia Reformationis." ⁴⁸ Georgii Spalatini, "Annales Reformationis."

must be upright to sustain their burdens? What if the Muse of History during this period and even to our own day was under duress? What if credulous admiration on the one hand and blind hatred on the other consciously or unconsciously guided the pen in its propagation of error and falsehood?

The unraveling of this tangled skein is the mission of modern critico-historical writing. The most hopeful sign is that Protestant writers themselves are roused to a sense of uncompromising earnestness to hasten the day of Truth's ultimate triumph.

The question naturally suggests itself have not later biographers deviated from the rut of conventionality and traditionalism and given us a fearlessly honest and conscientiously faithful, full-sized portrait of Luther?

An eminent German writer, Professor Henke, gives us little hope. "Luther's pupils almost deified their master," he writes, "and as rehearers of other men's sayings always speak in more exaggerated and boisterous language than they who use their own discretion, so these simon-pure Lutherans howled down every one who did not chime in with them in honoring the religious arbiter, who after death was elevated above all fallibility, and who did not acclaim his work the acme of perfection."⁴⁹

We will not attempt the ordeal of threading our way through the mazy, tortuous labyrinth of the cumulative Luther literature of the last three centuries, or risk the weariness of analyzing the superseded works of Sleidan, Seckendorf, Löscher, Uckert, Meurer, Pfizer, Jürgens, Thierisch, Lang, Schenkel, etc., etc., but focalize our attention on the ripest and richest fruit of contemporaneous success. Three names give us the crystallized sublimates of the last results in this field. We may designate the coalition collectively as the Luther Dreibund, alliteratively they appear as Kolde, Kawerau and Köstlin.

By a common consensus Dr. Julius Köstlin, professor of theology at Halle, stands forth as the chosen and accredited representative of these three Horatii, and in reviewing him we review the last word that has been spoken in the cause he defends. His work⁵⁰ is the most mature, scholarly and popular biography of Luther thus far written. It is at once the norm that guides and the arsenal that equips all modern Lutheran scholars and combatants. He brought to his work an intimate, if not thorough, acquaintance with Luther's theological writings and tendencies.⁵¹ His biography shows marked evidence of extensive reading, careful analysis, keen judgment and good taste—as far as Luther is concerned. Most of these attributes,

⁴⁹ H. P. K. Henke in Villers, "Versuch über den Geist und den Einfluss der Reformation Luthers," Vol. II., p. 79. Second ed. ⁵⁰ "Martin Luther, Sein Leben und seine Schriften," 2 vols. Elberfeld, 1883. ⁵¹ "Luther's Theologie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung," etc. J. Köstlin. 2 vols., 1863.

however, forsake him when he deals with the Catholic Church. In Catholic doctrine and practice he is an irreclaimable recidivist, who, in spite of repeatedly administered critical and public penance, relapses into his habitual sins. His aversion to the Middle Ages, his toning down of Luther's scurrility while flaunting that of his out-rivalled opponents, his slurring of those moot points—Luther's relation to Hutten, Sickingen and the revolutionary propaganda, Philip of Hesse's bigamy, the anti-Jewish pamphlets, the misrepresentation of Erasmus, which almost becomes a caricature—all plainly show that Froude, when he gleefully assures us that the student will leave this work "with no further questions to ask," is about as reliable a literary prophet as he is trustworthy as an historian. His attitude to the Catholic Church may best be inferred by the confession he boldly made in controversy that although he did not find in the Papacy absolute anti-Christianity, yet he detected "a progressive realization of anti-Christendom, which from the time of the Reformation even to the Council of the Vatican has made noteworthy advances." Of course, such a profession "will suffice to show," says a disinterested English writer, "that Dr. Köstlin writes rather from the standpoint of the Lutheran theologian than of the pure historian."⁵² "Notwithstanding the apparatus of material cited or printed in the two volumes of the original work," we are drawing upon an equally representative authority—"the information is manifestly too exclusively from one side and the bias is throughout clearly discernible. Some of the statements," it continues, "resting solely on Luther's own authority, clash singularly with those which we find on official record; for instance, in the recently published fasciculus of the *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae*."⁵³ "The further we continue in Dr. Köstlin's book," is the arraignment of a reviewer already quoted, "the less sympathy does the writer show with mediæval conceptions, the greater misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine. It is impossible to help feeling," and in a writer dealing with the Reformation this deficiency seems almost criminally inexcusable, "that for some reason mediæval writings have remained for him a sealed book."⁵⁴ He has represented the Church rather as it appeared to Luther than as it existed in reality in his accounts of the doctrines of penance, indulgence and invocation of saints," continues the same indictment; "he is considerably removed from the standpoint of the judicial historian."⁵⁵ His adhesion to the legends, "memorable

⁵² *Athenæum*, Nov., 1883, p. 661. ⁵³ *Academy*, Jan., 1884, p. 53. ⁵⁴ "It is indispensably necessary," says Maurenbrecher, "that the status of theology between the years 1480-1519 be most carefully examined. We must tear ourselves from the caricature which we read in the writings of the Reformers—from the misunderstandings they occasioned, and to ascertain what the theologians of that time really thought and taught from their own words." "Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit," pp. 221-222. ⁵⁵ *Athenæum*, ut sup.

words" (Kraftausdrücke) which rest on unverifiable evidence, and are discarded by scholars or hang on the slenderest thread for a precarious support, have forced from Von Sybel the reluctant admission that in the biography "critical winnowing does not always keep pace with patient research. It (the biography) is not calculated to entirely set aside the later whitewashing (Uebermalung) of the real Luther picture." With the deep-rooted, firmly grafted German Luther cultus in view, the same reviewer continues in a tone of regret rather than expostulation that "a life of Luther in all directions a finality was simply an impossibility."⁵⁶ Though we may not altogether concur with the *Quarterly Review* when, in a most admirable review of Luther's life and writings, it dismisses Köstlin's work with the remark that it "is a mine of valuable information, but it is dull in style, partisan in tone and displeases by its pietistic twang,"⁵⁷ yet we cannot shake off the conviction that it most signally fails to give us the picture of the—real Luther. With a change of names Kawerau's criticism of Plitt's life of the Reformer⁵⁸ applies most appositely to Köstlin's. "With this biography," is the contention of an acknowledged Reformation specialist, "just as with many others of our Luther, the impression as far as the reviewer is concerned remains, that not the whole gnarly Luther is presented to our Evangelical populace, but a Luther glossed over and toned down in reverent love—one conjured under the influence of partisan-colored traditions intended for his justification. . . . The customary way of portraying Luther gives us a colorless picture and will always allow those who do not share our reverence for Luther to brand this method of historical writing with bias."⁵⁹

With the historical integrity of Dr. Köstlin questioned, the vulnerable parts of his armor exposed, his partisanship forming the very jest of critical scholarship,⁶⁰ the thesis no longer remains a speculative or debatable one, but enters the domain of verifiable and verified truth.

Thus far, in order to maintain the most scrupulous objectivity, we allowed only Protestant authorities to support our attitude. Following this precedent we cannot close more appropriately or escape the suspicion of historic bias more effectually than by allowing a few eminent Protestant scholars—shining lights in church and literature—to summarize for us and bring in vivid realization the fact that mankind yet awaits the advent of the true Luther biographer.

⁵⁶ "Historische Zeitschrift," Vol. XLI., p. 230. ⁵⁷ July, 1897, p. 3. ⁵⁸ "Martin Luther's Leben und Wirken." Dr. Gustav Plitt und E. F. Petersen. ⁵⁹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Leipz., May 5, 1883. ⁶⁰ Writing of the easy credulity which still swallows the Luther legend, Karl Pearson satirically allows: "It must be true; I saw it in the newspaper;" or shall we say: "I saw it in Professor Köstlin's book or Mr. Froude's essays!" *Athenæum*, Oct., 1883, p. 465.

"On the part of Protestants," writes one of Germany's great historians, Menzel, "it is an accepted maxim to represent to oneself the Reformers as lords and half saints. This prejudice is indeed broken in historically versed circles, but among the large mass of the evangelical population it is still, not, however, to the preservation of truth, maintained. It passes current as 'cultured' and is paraded as a mark of 'scientific investigation' when they (the populace) with their criticism and negation cut from even the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. But woe to him who with the torch of science invades the vestibule of the temple in which prejudice and tradition have erected the throne to the "heroes of the Reformation" and their works. The historical investigator who possesses such a foolhardiness is sure to be decried as a crypto-Catholic. . . . Whoever," he continues, "swerved from the path (of the legendary Reformation history) had to be prepared for the most shocking defamation and enmity, and must, in spite of all praise and exaltation of German impartiality, be prepared for the same to-day."⁸¹

About thirty years after this lament, in view of the rapid and sweeping strides historical writing made, better results were to be expected. Professor Maurenbrecher, of the Königsberg University—no sciolist in Reformation literature, but a man whose contributions permanently enriched that period and who perhaps better than any Protestant author of the century possessed the qualifications of giving us a history of the Reformation—deplores the absence of a Luther biography. "In spite of all that contemporaries, posterity, theologians and historians and publicists have written about Luther, his life, his person, his character, his theology, only the initiative steps have thus far been taken to a real history of the man, to a proper estimate of his actual significance. . . . Too great is the rubbish and garbage (der Schutt und der Unrath) which intentionally or unintentionally the prevailing theological standpoint concerning the Reformation period has inaugurated; too strong is the power of the deep-seated nonsense which one is accustomed to have offered and be satisfied with; who would flatter himself with the hope that without the most exhaustive researches the current *fable convenue* can be set aside, that without the most arduous labor the real facts can by critical methods be secured from original sources?"⁸²

The Luther revival commemorating the four hundredth birthday of the Reformer, celebrated in Germany with a national hysteria of festivity and productive of an incredibly large literary output of poems, dramas, novels, music dramas, pamphlets and more preten-

⁸¹ "Neue Geschichte der Deutschen." K. A. Menzel. Vol.-II., p. 44; Vol. III., p. 3. ⁸² "Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit," pp. 207-208. Leipz., 1873.

tious works, fairly glutting the book market, left the authentic Luther biography a still crying want, in spite of Kolde's, Plitt's and Köstlin's efforts. In 1896 Professor Krogh-Tønning, of the Christiania University, and the most prominent and admittedly commanding theologian in Norway, raises his voice in indignant protest that historic verity should still be stifled by romance and myth. "There are two Luthers" is his stressful language—"a mythical and historical. Usually one occupies oneself with the mythical one decked out in all perfections. . . . The saddest feature of this Luther *cultus* is the demand that the man (Luther) should claim exemption from all judgments regulating the universal moral standards. All should be excused in him. To quote his own words, where they are unpardonable, is looked upon as a downright libel. . . . It is strictly orthodox to designate his most offensive language as heroic faith. Here the *cultus* simply becomes disgusting. If a courageous soul should make a mild attempt with the one hand to portray the true Luther, he can only escape the danger of giving scandal by placing at the same time with the other hand the aureole of sanctity on Luther's head."⁶³

As a representative of the cultured lay and political element in Germany few names are more honored and carry greater weight than that of George Frederic Kolb. A publicist, statistician, sociologist, editor of two of the most influential German papers,⁶⁴ his name became a household word. "A proper judgment of the man who above all was the leading spirit of the Reformation," is his statement of the case, "was until recently hardly possible, because not only were most writers prejudiced by this or that confessionism, but because Luther, almost like a Catholic saint, became a legendary character, so that a proper estimate, based on the evidence of well-established facts, was absent. . . . Luther's was a violent, despotic nature. The right he assumed for himself he unhesitatingly denied to others. His will was to be the only standard. . . . The 'Man of God,' the supernatural spirit, in which character he is represented—Luther was only in legend."⁶⁵

Two vital truths impress themselves upon the mind of the thoughtful reader in weighing and measuring the full import of what has been discussed; the first is emphatic, if not indisputable: that in the words of Maurenbrecher "there exists to-day not one work which can honestly, with a safe conscience, be recommended as a scientific biography; yes, judging from the present condition of affairs, there is little prospect that a good 'life of Luther' can be written in the

⁶³ "Der Protestantismus in der Gegenwart" (translation), p. 77. Berlin, 1896.
⁶⁴ *Frankfurter* and *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. ⁶⁵ "Kultur Geschichte der Menschheit," Vol. II., p. 316 et seq. Leipz., 1873.

near future;"⁶⁶ the second not less significant and provocative of serious reflection, when an English critic tells us "that some day possibly a history of the Reformation may be written by an impartial historian," and "that it will paint Luther as the reverse of an apostle."⁶⁷

H. G. GANSS.

Carlisle, Pa.

⁶⁶ Ut sup. ⁶⁷ *Athenæum*, 1884, p. 726.

Scientific Chronicle.

MAXIMITE.

The tests made at Sandy Hook of the new explosive, the invention of Hudson Maxim, place it first among high explosives. Like Lyddite, Maximite is a picric acid compound, but while the former is very sensitive to shock, the latter is remarkably insensitive.

The tests to which the Government put a new explosive before accepting it are very severe. First, perfect stability is required, and this is tested by subjecting it to a severe heat test for 15 minutes. Secondly, it must be insensitive to shock. This is determined by the height from which a heavy hammer must fall to explode it. Next its explosive force is determined. A shell is filled with the material and a powerful exploder, set off electrically, is used to explode it. The number and shape of the fragments into which the shell is broken indicate the explosive force. If satisfactory up to this point, then an armor-piercing shell is filled with it and the shell is fired through a nickel steel plate almost thick enough to stop the shell. If the explosive stands this shock, where the entire velocity of the shell is checked in passing through the plate, there will be no danger in projecting it from ordnance at any desired velocity.

Maximite withstood all these tests most satisfactorily. Melted cast iron may be poured upon Maximite without danger of exploding it. A 12-inch steel armor-piercing shell weighing 1,000 pounds was filled with the new explosive. By means of a detonating fuse, electrically fired, the Maximite was exploded. So great was the force of the explosion that 7,000 fragments of the shell were recovered. A 12-inch shell containing 70 pounds of Maximite was fired through a 7-inch Harveyized nickel steel plate and recovered from the sand-butt behind the plate. When this proved that it was insensitive to the shock, a time fuse was attached to a similar charge and it was fired through a 5¾-inch plate. The shell exploded when it was about half way through the plate. The plate was shattered into fragments and the abutment demolished. The time fuse used is capable of withstanding the shock of the projectile against the armor plate and is intended to detonate the charge immediately after the shell pierces the armor. This requires delicate adjustment; the timing is gauged to hundredths of a second. It is better that the shell should explode in the plate than one hundred yards beyond. The best results would come from an explosion just as the shell comes through the plate. But the experiment referred to shows that

Maximite exploded in the armor of a battleship would put it out of action.

The *Scientific American* for May 25, 1901, thus describes what was the most interesting test of the series, "when a 12-inch mortar shell, known as the torpedo shell, was fired from a 12-inch seacoast rifle at full velocity and pressure, with a charge of brown prismatic gunpowder. The shell carried 143 pounds of Maximite, was armed with a fuse and fired through a sand-crib faced with heavy timbers. The velocity of the projectile was probably about 2,100 feet per second, and as the column of explosive was four feet long, the shock of acceleration upon the Maximite must have been very severe, although not comparable, of course, with the shock on even a much shorter column in penetrating heavy armor plate. This was the largest charge of high explosive ever thrown from a powder gun in a service shell and at service pressure and velocity. The projectile exploded just as it emerged from the back side of the crib. The projectile was broken into very small fragments, averaging from the size of a rifle ball to several ounces. A crow and a ground sparrow were struck upon the wing and brought down from the sky by the flying fragments and fell near the sand-crib, the sparrow falling directly into the crater, a result which suggests the completeness of the fragmentation."

This new explosive has a low fusing point, namely, 174 degrees F., considerably below the boiling point of water. When heat is applied it first melts and then evaporates. So that a building filled with it might take fire and burn to the ground without any danger of explosion.

The success of the aerial torpedo implies a complete change in our war vessels. Mr. Maxim, writing in the *Popular Science Monthly* March, 1901, says: "The war vessel that must follow as a natural result of the success of the aerial torpedo will be an unarmored, or only partially armored, gunboat or cruiser of small dimensions, capable of traveling at very high speed. It will be a sort of floating gun platform, and will cost only a fraction of what the battleship costs, while a single one of these gunboats will afford far more protection than the most powerful battleship."

THE TELEPHONOGRAPH.

Among the many improvements in the phonograph since its invention by Edison, that of M. Waldemar Poulsen is perhaps the most interesting. The familiar way of making a phonographic record is by means of a stylus attached to the under side of a diaphragm and

bearing upon a surface of wax or soft metal. The diaphragm is set in vibration by the sound waves and the stylus moving with it indents the moving surface upon which it bears. These indentations form the record. When the stylus is passed over this record, the diaphragm is set in vibration and the sound is reproduced.

In the ordinary phonograph the record is a mechanical one. In the improved form of Mr. Poulsen the record is magnetic. A steel wire is wound spirally upon a cylinder, with a clear space between the coils of the helix. A small electro-magnet is adjusted so that its poles are close to but not in contact with the wire. This electro-magnet is so mounted that it can travel axially along the spiral. A telephone transmitter and a battery are placed in a circuit with the electro-magnet.

To make a record the operator speaks into the telephone transmitter. The vibrations of the diaphragm cause variations in the electric current passing through the circuit and hence vary the magnetization of the electro-magnet and consequently produce corresponding variations in the magnetization of the spiral steel wire, in front of which the magnet passes. This steel wire then holds the record in the varying degrees of magnetization along its length.

When the operation is reversed every variation in the magnetization of the wire produces a corresponding change in the magnetic intensity of the core of the electro-magnet. These changes induce electric pulsations in the circuit and these pulsations bring about a vibration of the diaphragm of the transmitter similar to those with which it moved to produce the record, and thus the sound is reproduced.

Among the advantages claimed for this form of record are superior faithfulness to the original and durability without the slightest deterioration. Experiments have shown that after 10,000 repetitions of a record had been made there was no appreciable weakening in the reproduction.

The wire may be passed before several receivers and the record sent to different telephone stations. Such an arrangement might also be employed as a telephone relay for long distance lines, the record made at the end of one section being delivered into the transmitter of the next. When this is done the phonograph will assume a commercial importance. In this connection we may call attention to Mr. Edison's improved record for the well-known form of instrument.

The wax record was undoubtedly a great improvement on the tin-foil one, but still it deteriorates under frequent repetitions and it is easily scratched or broken. A recent patent issued to Mr. Edison is for an improved record. Mr. Edison takes a copper

electroplate of a wax record. This copper relief of the record is electroplated with silver, the silver, of course, taking the same form as the original record. The copper is then dissolved away by an acid. Before the copper electroplate is made the wax cylinder is revolved in a high vacuum, through which an electric discharge is passing between gold electrodes. Under these conditions the wax cylinder is subjected to a shower of gold dust from the terminals, and this dust adheres to it, forming a uniform coating of excessive thinness. As this gold is not affected by the acid when the copper is eaten away, we have a gold-plated silver record. The silver shell may be backed up by other material, the hard metal surface holding the permanent record.

PURITY OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS.

Last fall several cases of arsenical poisoning in Manchester, England, led to an investigation of the cause, which disclosed that it was due to a certain brand of beer. In brewing this beer the manufacturers used glucose of a certain make. This glucose was made by means of a sulphuric acid which had been made from pyrites containing, as is almost always the case, arsenic. Prior to this the sulphuric acid employed had been made from sulphur. The chain of evidence was complete and established the fact that the arsenic in the beer came from the pyrites and in sufficient quantity to produce the evil effects witnessed.

The examination brought out the difficulty of detecting arsenic in beer and disclosed the fact that the most reliable test is that of Reinsch. The beer is acidified strongly with pure hydrochloric acid and boiled with a piece of clean copper foil. The black deposit on the copper is sublimated in a glass tube and the appearance of a sublimate of bright octahedral crystals of arsenious oxide is an evidence of the presence of arsenic in the beer.

Another result of these investigations is the necessity of watching more closely the manufacture of many products used in pharmacy and in the manufacture of which sulphuric acid is used. These results have led to a further study of the injurious constituents of distilled liquors. The researches of Dujardin-Beaumetz some twenty years ago showed that the toxic action of pure ethyl alcohol was zero. Hogs kept in a state of continual intoxication for the space of three years, on being allowed to sober up, were in perfect health, and after slaughtering showed no lesions of any organ. This, however, was the case when absolutely pure liquor was used. When, however, ordinary spirits were fed to the hogs, they quickly

succumbed, showing lesions, especially of the liver, similar to those in the case of human inebriates.

The conclusions drawn from these experiments by Dujardin-Beaumetz was that the toxic action was due to the presence of higher alcohols, especially amyl alcohol, the chief ingredient of fusel oil. The experiments made lately by Sir Lander Brunton seem, on the other hand, to prove that the presence of fusel oil in such quantities as it usually occurs is not a menace to public health. The greatest danger comes from furfural and other similar aldehydes which come from the husk of the grain. Furfural is present in all whiskies, but in quantities it is found especially in those made by modern processes, where the distillation is pushed to its furthest limit, so as to obtain the greatest amount of liquor possible per bushel of grain. In Brunton's experiments animals intoxicated with liquor from which furfural had been removed showed no bad effects when they sobered up, while those made drunk with liquor containing furfural did. The "bracers" used after intoxication seem to point to furfural as the source of the evil effects. All these "bracers" contain ammonia or similar compound, which chemically combine with the furfural and neutralizes its effects.

THE NICARAGUA CANAL.

The discussions growing out of the building of an Isthmian Canal bring to light grave questions, which demand that hasty partisan advocacy of any particular route must yield to an enlightened study of all the difficulties of the situation if we are to reach a solution in accordance with sound engineering and commercial principles. Of late M. Bunau-Varilla, a distinguished French engineer, has been lecturing on the subject, and the *Railroad Gazette* gives many telling extracts from these lectures. While the lecturer discussed comparative length, curvature, magnitude, cost and conditions of stability, still he lays special stress on the discussion of the seismic disturbances which will be an important factor affecting the stability of the canal. The discussion concerns only the two routes of which there is question, Panama and Nicaragua.

According to M. Bunau-Varilla, "in Panama there is within a distance of 180 miles from the canal no volcano, even extinct." Nicaragua, on the contrary, has always been the theatre of earthquakes. At Panama the isthmus has not been modified since the quarternary period. At Nicaragua the lake was formerly a gulf in the Pacific and is associated with the most terrible volcanic eruption

ever recorded in history before that of Krakatoa. "The explosion of the volcano Coseguina in 1835 lasted forty-four hours, the noise was heard at a distance of 1,000 miles, the ashes were brought 1,400 miles by the wind. During these forty-four hours the volcano ejected every six minutes a volume of stone and ashes equal to the total volume of the prism of the Nicaragua Canal, as it was calculated by the Nicaragua Canal Commission and which will necessitate eight years of excavation."

The volcano Omotepe, which is continuously active and which was in violent eruption in 1883, is in the centre of Lake Nicaragua. Besides these two volcanoes there are several others on the shore of the lake or in the neighborhood which are at present active or have recently been so.

Mr. Bertrand, of the Institute of France, a distinguished geologist, has recently established two facts. First, Lake Nicaragua is one of the lines of least resistance in Central America, and hence the site of earthquake disturbances. Secondly, the subterranean fire is going south and increasing in Nicaragua. There was a gain of five per cent. in the number of explosions or earthquakes recorded in Nicaragua during the nineteenth century over preceding centuries. No volcanoes have become extinct in Nicaragua, but a new one, Las Pilas, was born in 1850.

These facts require careful consideration, for a fissure in a dam made by a seismic disturbance or a tidal wave in the lake due to the same cause would mean the destruction of the whole work.

NOTES.

Geology and the Deluge.—In the June number of *McClure's Magazine* Dr. Frederick G. Wright, of Oberlin College, gives an interesting and instructive account of a geological trip through Central Asia and Southern Siberia. The writer went to study the evidences of the "Ice Age" in Asia, but contrary to his expectations, he found none either in Central Asia or Southern Siberia. The geological conditions which confronted him in these regions were such that the only explanation that would fit them was that of an extensive submergence of the region where Scripture and tradition locate the Flood that destroyed the whole human race except Noah and his family. After describing his itinerary and pointing out some of the evidence for the submergence that extends from Mongolia to the western borders of Russia, the writer has this to say on the relation of these discoveries to the Bible narrative of the Deluge: "Our belief

in the occurrence of the Noachian deluge must always rest primarily on the historical evidence, and only secondarily on the scientific. A flood of the short duration described in the Book of Genesis could not be expected to leave any permanent record in the superficial deposits made during its continuance. The most which science can do is to remove the objections which she herself has raised. These objections have principally been in the line of showing that such changes of level as are implied in the story of the flood are so highly improbable that scarcely any amount of human testimony could establish the fact. What the recent discoveries have shown is that during and subsequent to the glacial period, and since the advent of man, there has existed such an instability of the earth's crust that the present cannot be made a measure of the past. Man has certainly witnessed catastrophes by flood which are quite analogous to the one described in Genesis."

Hydrogen in the Atmosphere.—For a number of years past the researches of Gautier have tended to establish the fact, now admitted, that hydrogen is a normal constituent of the atmosphere. Dewar, in England, has condensed hydrogen directly from the atmosphere, and Gautier has made quantitative determinations of the amount in different localities. Some of these results show that in Paris hydrogen is not a constant quantity in the air. In forest air only traces of hydrogen were found, while at a certain mountain station in the Pyrenees seventeen volumes were found to the 100,000 of air. At a sea station on the coast of Brittany two volumes of the gas were present in 10,000 of air. The source and function of atmospheric hydrogen are as yet unknown. A more careful determination of the boiling point of hydrogen recently made by Dewar places it at -252.5 degrees, or about 20 degrees above the absolute zero.

Wireless Telegraphy.—In our last Chronicle we referred to a useful application of wireless telegraphy in warning ships from danger points along coasts, and in time of fog, of each other's approach. In tests recently made at the mouth of the Thames the efficiency of such a system was clearly proved. In these tests the shore station was established at Shoeburyness. A steam launch provided with a receiving instrument put off from South End. A stiff breeze was blowing and a thick fog hung over the water. When the launch stood about eight miles out to sea they began to work the apparatus on shore. The zone of influence of this apparatus extended only seven miles from shore. The launch put about and moved shorewards. As soon as it came within the sphere of influence of the shore instruments the bell on the launch began to ring, and at the same time the word "Southend," the danger point, was printed on

the tape machine. The vessel then repeatedly put out to sea and left the field of influence to return to it at different points. But whenever it entered the field of influence the instruments received the warnings from the shore station. The trials lasted two hours, and the instruments never once failed.

Development of Photographs.—Up to a very recent date we have so associated the dark-room with the development of photographs that it was regarded as absolutely indispensable. Professor Nipher, of St. Louis, has rudely shattered this belief by showing that the most sensitive photographic plate may be manipulated in open day and perfect pictures developed upon them in sunlight. The plate may be carried out into the sunlight, unwrapped, placed in the holder and after exposure in the camera taken from the holder and put into the developing bath in full daylight and there developed. To develop pictures in this way the exposure in the camera must be longer than when they are to be developed in the dark-room. Pictures developed in sunlight are positives, while those developed in the dark-room are negatives. The distinction between the two is that the shadows show light in the negative and dark in the positive. Professor Nipher has also shown that no plate need ever be lost on account of over-exposure. When the exposure has been so great that the development cannot be controlled in the dark-room, it may be developed in the light, even if a million times over-exposed. The best results have been obtained by a hydrochinone developer.

Phototherapy.—This is the name given to the new art of healing certain skin diseases by means of solar radiations. It is well known that these radiations are not confined to the luminous ones which give us the visible spectrum. Below the red we have calorific radiations, so called because their presence is readily detected by an increase in temperature. Beyond the violet there are radiations which are especially characterized by the chemical effects they produce. The calorific rays have been employed in the treatment of small-pox patients. The theory underlying the treatment was that in this eruptive affection the irritation of the skin was due to the action of the chemical rays. By cutting off these rays and allowing only red light to reach the patient the inflammatory effects of the eruption are reduced to a minimum, as has been proved by experiment. These results suggested the possibility of using the chemical rays to cure certain skin diseases that are parasitic, the chemical violet radiations being destructive of the microbes. Professor Finsen, of Copenhagen, was the first to practically test the efficiency of this treatment. Professor Finsen has especially directed his experiments to the cure of lupus. In practice the solar rays are filtered through lenses filled

VOL. XXVI—13

with water that has been colored blue. Through such lenses only the chemical rays pass, and they are directed on the affected part of the patient to be treated. Electric light may be employed instead of sunlight. It is reported that up to the 1st of January, 1900, out of 462 cases treated for lupus, Professor Finsen had 311 cures. The reason given for the number of cures not being greater was that in the other cases the treatment was interrupted for one reason or another. It is further stated that only four cases proved refractory under the treatment. That the experimental stage of phototherapy is passed seems clear from this success and from the fact that MM. Lortet and Genoud, of the Faculty of Medicine of Lyons, have introduced the Finsen methods with like success.

Solar Eclipse of May 18, 1901.—The weather conditions prevailing at many of the stations selected to observe the total solar eclipse were unfavorable. For the American observers Professor Todd reports from Singkel, Sumatra, that the sky was cloudy and that during the total eclipse no instruments could be operated except the polariscope and the X-ray apparatus. Professor Burton, in charge of the party from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, telegraphs that the weather was cloudy during a portion of the eclipse, but that all four contacts were observed and at totality a brilliant corona was visible for nearly six minutes. Photographs were taken and the shadow bands also were observed photographically. The observers at the Government Royal Alfred Observatory at Mauritius report that the first contact was lost, but the other three were determined fairly well. Fifty-two photographs of the corona were obtained during totality. Forty-one photographs of partial phases were also made. During totality eighteen photographs of the spectrum were also secured. In addition a kinematographic record of the eclipse was secured. The Greenwich instruments, set up about six miles from the coast of Sumatra, were, as in the case of Professor Todd's, idle on account of cloudiness. The Dutch party in the same neighborhood reports that throughout the time of eclipse the sky was covered with thin clouds. The observations at Solok were almost a total failure. At Singapore the eclipse was very well seen and series of observations on temperature variations made. The temperature in full sun before eclipse was 143 degrees and during totality it fell to 81 degrees. At this writing no detailed account of the results is at hand.

Pine Needles.—The needles from the yellow Oregon pine are the source of a new industry on the Pacific Coast. The leaves of this pine average twenty inches in length. The oil extracted from these leaves and the fiber are both in demand. Those suffering from

asthma obtain relief from the use of the oil, and it is claimed that insomnia is cured by sleeping on pillows stuffed with the fragrant fiber of the pine leaf. Stripping the pine of its leaves has been pronounced beneficial to the tree by the expert of the Forestry Commission. Two crops are gathered yearly, one in April and one in October, the latter being the larger. Men and women are employed to strip the leaves from the trees and receive 25 cents per hundred pound of the pine needles. They average about \$1.25 per day. The present factory can handle 2,000 pounds of leaves daily, and the yield in oil from this amount is ten pounds. It requires about four days to prepare the fiber, to steam, to wash and to dry it. If no oil has been distilled from the leaves, the fiber is of a better quality and brings about ten cents a pound in the market. The fiber may be woven into fabrics. Mixed with hair it is used for mattresses and pillows. It is also employed as a partial filler for cigars. The oil is used for scenting toilet soaps and flavoring candies. This industry has come from Germany. There the laws are more stringent. In some places they may use only the needles that have fallen on the ground. These dead leaves give an inferior oil and fiber. Hence it is clear that this industry will grow where the stripping of the profitable green leaves from the pine is regarded as beneficial to the tree.

New Edison Storage Battery.—The storage battery has already secured a permanent place in the work of direct current central stations. But the cell in use is the Plante lead cell of 1860. Mr. Edison has now brought out what seems to be the first successful improvement in the storage battery. He started out to make a cell that would not deteriorate by work, that would have a large capacity per unit of mass, that could be rapidly charged and discharged, that could stand careless treatment and would be inexpensive. He claims these advantages for his new storage cell. The cell is a nickel-iron cell. The iron is the positive element and a superoxide of nickel is the negative element of the cell. The electrolyte or liquid is a twenty per cent. solution of potassium hydroxide. The positive plate consists of cakes made of a finely divided compound of iron and graphite, formed under hydraulic pressure and supported by a steel framework, into which they fit. The cakes in the negative plate are of a finely divided nickel compound and graphite. The graphite does not take part in the chemical action. Its function is to increase the conductivity of the cakes or briquettes in the two plates of the cell. In action the cell is an oxygen lift. In charging, oxygen is carried from the iron plate to the nickel, and in discharge it falls back to the iron on account of greater chemical affinity. In

Mr. Kennelly's description of this cell before the Institute of Electrical Engineers, New York, May 21, 1901, the energy of the cell is expressed by says that the energy furnished at its terminals is sufficient to lift the weight of the cell approximately seven miles against the force of gravity. The well-known lead storage cell could lift its own weight from two to three miles only. Among the other advantages of this cell may be mentioned structural strength due to the steel which replaces the weak, heavy lead of the old type. There is also a gain in the new cell on account of the fact that no period of formation or incubation is required as was the case with the lead cell. As soon as the salts are inserted in the steel framework the plate is ready for charging in the ordinary way. In the old style efficiency of the cell fell off partly on account of the acid being used up, but in the new cell the alkaline solution does not enter into the chemical action. The plates may be removed after charging and dried in the air without impairing their efficiency, for on being put back into the liquid they act at once and normally on charge and discharge. Even when the plate has been reversed by sending the current in the wrong direction, and it is again brought back, it works as well as ever, showing that it can withstand considerable abuse. We must, however, await the action of this cell under practical conditions as soon as the inventor will be able to put it in the market.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Notices.

IN THE BEGINNING (*Les Origines*). By *J. Guibert, S. S.*, Superior of the "Institute Catholique" of Paris and formerly Professor of Science at Issy. Translated from the French by *G. S. Whitmarsh*. 12mo., pp. xvi., 379. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This work was written by the reverend author for his pupils at Issy, while he was professor of science at that institution. Speaking of his intention in composing the work, he says: "Having to give instructions on natural sciences to young philosophers, I found it impossible to confine myself to the experimental and practical part only; it was necessary to go back to first causes, and treat of such questions as the study of nature invariably raises in thoughtful minds."

It is necessary for young ecclesiastics to propagate the faith and defend it against all attacks, and since none of its enemies are bolder than Materialists, who make great progress with the ignorant and wrongly educated, because they appeal to the natural sciences and claim that they contradict Christian revelation, it is most important that defenders of the faith should be able to meet them on their own ground. What is more common than the assertion that faith is opposed to science? It is repeated so often that it is pretty generally accepted. Those who believe in the truths of Christian revelation are looked upon as narrow-minded and unprogressive. It is so easy to make a show of learning and to move the crowd by ridicule.

Those who are firmly grounded in their faith are not troubled by the vain show of their enemies, and as it is not possible for all to inform themselves on such matters, they very wisely fall back on their infallible guide and the divinely appointed custodian and interpreter of God's word, the Church. They know that He cannot err because He is truth, and that she cannot err because she is guided by Him, and that truth cannot contradict truth, and hence that the opposition between science and revelation is apparent only. Persons on both sides often deceive themselves by supposing that faith and science teach things which they do not teach at all. Hence also apparent contradictions. There cannot be any real contradiction. In order to make this truth clear, the author of the work before us has prepared it. He says:

"Materialists have for some time had great weight with the people, because they alone (almost) had strengthened their position with the aid of science. It is also most essential that the young clerics should be wanting in no knowledge concerning humanity, and that they

should be able to give incontestible proof of their competence, both in order to obtain a hearing when they speak and also that they may learn to speak with accuracy and power. Not only have they nothing to lose in the study of human sciences, but their apostolic ministry will benefit by the earnest endeavors they have made to inform themselves on these matters. Science is not the exclusive right of one particular school of thought; it renders up its secrets to those who study it with care. It is by a mistaken construction that it is made to serve the ends of materialism and atheism. In causing it to add its testimony to the glories of the Author of Nature learned Catholics would make science forward its legitimate object."

Of course, the book does not pretend to be an exhaustive scientific treatise, nor does it treat of exegesis or dogma. The author's purpose is to give to theologians and exegetists sufficient data to enable them to interpret correctly texts dealing with psychical and physical origins.

He has been careful to keep before his mind the requirements of the class for which he writes, and to avoid the two great dangers that confront a writer on this subject, namely, an unwarrantable compliance with theories in favor among the learned, and a blind attachment to certain ideas which have no firm foundation, but which some men erroneously consider as identical with the faith.

"In order to maintain the *via media*," he says, "which truth frequents, I imposed on myself the three following obligations: Honestly explain systems, even those which I have to oppose; assert with firmness what is well established; leave the questions open which have not yet received a solution."

One can see at a glance the excellence of this plan. It has been faithfully followed. The work is unusually well arranged, clear and convincing. Each chapter is begun with a statement of the question; the false system is described, and the arguments of its defenders are stated; then follows the true system with the arguments to prove it, and the whole is closed with a summary, followed by a bibliography. This last feature is particularly commendable, not only because of its great value, but because of its rarity.

The book is illustrated with very good engravings that will help the reader very much. Altogether it is a very satisfying work, and one that can be recommended without hesitation to do all that it promises.

THE HISTORY OF THE JESUITS IN ENGLAND, 1580-1773. By *Ethelred L. Taunton*, author of "The English Black Monks of St. Benedict," etc. 8vo., pp. x., 513, illustrated. London: Methuen & Co.

This is one of the notable books of the year. Its author is a Catholic priest who has been devoting his time to historical work,

and who has appeared before the public on several occasions, probably most prominently when he published his "History of the Black Monks of St. Benedict." He is evidently a hard student and a constant writer. But these are not the only qualifications required in a historian; indeed, one might say that these are the least important. If the writer be not a person of good judgment; if he be not able to hold the scale in his hand without inclining in the least to one side or to the other; if he have a grievance to air or a wrong, real or imaginary, to avenge; if he be easily swayed by likes and dislikes, or if he hold a brief for any client, whether king or subject, community or nation, then his industry will work harm to himself and others.

There are many historical writers, but few historians. Some are bad from the start, and should never have begun; others begin well, but fail as they go on; a few succeed until the end, and then spoil all by false reasoning.

Father Taunton has chosen an important subject this time. The sons of Ignatius are never lay figures on the stage of any country; they are star actors whenever they appear. This is true of every country and every age since their foundation; but it is particularly true of England during the two centuries which ended in 1773. During the persecutions which were carried on under successive sovereigns they were active figures, several of them laying down their lives for the faith.

It is very clear from the first page of the preface to Father Taunton's History that he is against the Jesuits. On that page he declares that in England "The Jesuits, as a body, stood for the Catholic Reaction, from first to last a political expedient. The clergy, on the other hand, contented themselves with the course of religion." From that point until the end he pictures them as tricky, unscrupulous men, scheming always for the advancement of the society, and not hesitating to trample on others in order to advance their own interests. They are accused of lying, even under oath. They are held up as traitors plotting to unseat a rightful sovereign and give his throne to a usurper. Their actions may seem good sometimes, and their declarations of purpose sincere, but this historian can always prove, at least to his own satisfaction, that they are not to be trusted. He is willing to take the word of their enemies against them almost without exception; he quotes some authorities who are really not worth mentioning; and he makes accusations at times without giving the authority at all, or without giving the place from which the quotation is taken. When factions speak in their favor their motives are always questioned. In his anxiety to down them he forgets his premises sometimes when drawing his conclusions.

For two reasons especially he condemns them: because, he says, they were opposed to the secular clergy, and because they wished to

place a Spaniard on the English throne. We cannot find any good reason for either assertion. If any misunderstanding arose between the secular clergy and the Jesuits, it does not follow at all that the latter were ambitious for the places which the former occupied, or that they wished to gain the ascendancy over them in order to gratify their desire to rule, nor has it been proved. If they tried to bring about the succession of a sovereign who would treat Catholics fairly, they were justified in using all lawful means to that end. We cannot find that they went any further.

It is important in judging men to take an account of all their circumstances: time, place, education, training, customs and manners—all must receive due consideration. This Father Taunton failed to do when writing his history of the Jesuits in England.

We had intended to quote from the book, but the general tone is so biased that limited quotations would not serve our purpose. We are sorry to have to speak so severely of a work which is evidently the result of much time and labor, and which might have done very great good. We are afraid that it will do great harm. The writer of it has whetted a knife for the enemy. At this very time when French infidels are warring on the religious orders and when the Venerable Head of the Church stretches forth his aged arm in their defense, this book comes with very bad grace indeed from the pen of one of our own household.

THE BIBLE AND RATIONALISM; or, Answer to Difficulties of the Bible. Completely revised and greatly enlarged. By *Rev. John Thein*. Four volumes, royal octavo. Vol. I., Answers to Difficulties in the Books of Moses. Vol. II., Answers to Difficulties in the Historical, Didactic, Sapiential and Prophetical Books of the Old Testament. Vol. III., Answers to Difficulties in the Books of the New Testament. Vol. IV., Answers to Difficulties in the Mosaic, Cosmogony, Anthropology and Biblical Chronology.

Father Thein's work is already well known in a former edition. Its many excellencies have been recognized and it has received a warm welcome from all thoughtful persons who believe in divine revelation, irrespective of creed. The general Catholic reader learned from it that the sneers of the infidel and the scoffer are the result of ignorance and not of learning. These did not understand this wonderful book of the Sacred Scriptures; they had not time nor inclination nor ability to study it; their pride prevented them from submitting their judgment to the divinely appointed interpreter of it; their vicious lives tempted them to deny the authenticity of the law and even the existence of the law giver.

Protestants were not slow to see in it an effectual weapon against those who sought to destroy their sole rule of faith. Even if by some almost impossible accident every copy of the Sacred Scrip-

tures were destroyed, the Catholic would have the Church to guide him, which existed before the Bible was written, under whose direction it was made and who alone can vouch for its genuineness; but the Protestant would be left without any guide and would be forced to accept the direction of the Church of Christ, which indeed he now does, although perhaps unconsciously.

For the Protestant the most important thing in religion is the Bible. He ought to be very jealous of it, and he ought to defend it against all attacks. He, more than any one else, should welcome every weapon of defense against the enemies of the Sacred Text, and hence he should appreciate Father Thein's book.

Even those who have no practical religion, but who live rightly according to the natural law, should stand for divine revelation, because the natural law is founded on the divine, and should join hands with the defenders of the faith against those who would destroy all faith and necessarily all true morality.

These thoughts help us to understand the value of the work before us. All right minded persons acknowledge the importance of the Sacred Scriptures because they contain God's communications to man. All believe in them because they have stood the test of ages and because they have been preserved by the Church, the appointed custodian of them. All know that the attacks of the present are futile, as were the attacks of the past, and that there is an answer to every objection that can be brought forward. It is not possible, however, for each person to find the answers to these objections, because the necessary time, ability, mental training, education and opportunity are not at the command of every one. All men do not try to master the difficulties of medicine, law, astronomy and other sciences. Why, then, should all be expected to fit themselves to grasp the full meaning of the Sacred Text, which is professedly difficult and which requires more knowledge than any of the sciences, and indeed presupposes a mastery of several of them? Hence the importance of a guide, and we have a good one in the book under review.

It is not perfect, for the perfect book is as rare as the perfect man; but it is a work that was very much needed and that should be well patronized. It may be well to note that the volumes are distinct and may be purchased singly, although we imagine that most readers will want the complete set.

A DAY IN THE CLOISTER. Adapted from the German of Dom Sebastian Von Oer, O. S. B., of St. Martin's Abbey, Beuron. By Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B., of St. Thomas' Abbey, Erdington. 12mo, pp. 291. St. Louis: B. Herder.

The world knows little about monks and monasteries. It thinks that it knows a great deal. It has asked many questions about them,

and they have been answered by persons who, unable or unwilling to learn the truth, have told lies. The world gets most of its notions about monks and monasteries from novelists, and poets, and artists, who draw mainly on their imagination, and place before their patrons fiction and caricature instead of fact and truth.

And yet there are in the world many persons who wish to know the truth about this subject—not only Catholics, but Protestants and unbelievers. Thinking persons who have any knowledge of history at all must realize that those monasteries which were the centres of industry, learning, prayer and charity, and which in many instances became the foundations of important universities and cities, could not have been the work of lazy, ignorant, licentious and bibulous monks.

For the benefit of fair-minded searchers after truth, a Benedictine monk has written down in the volume before us a description of a monastery in the present day. Not a ruined, deserted monastery, such as the traveler sees so often in Italy, France and England, but one full of life and energy. He introduces the reader into all its parts; presents him to the different persons who dwell in it, and shows him the work that is done there. There is no mystery, no secret, no fiction, no poetry, but the plain unvarnished truth.

He who makes this visit under the guidance of the author will be well repaid for his trouble. He will see a Christian household modeled on the home at Nazareth. He will behold a true Christian community founded on the precepts and maxims of Christ. He will not find the lazy, dirty, wicked monk of so-called history and mis-called art, but on all sides he will be edified by the pictures of industry, prayer and virtue that are presented to him.

We wish most heartily that we could get this book into the hands of those poor deluded souls who hunger for the stories of converted priests and escaped nuns, but this is too much to hope for. We must content ourselves with commending it highly to all intelligent persons without distinction.

It is gotten up in a manner worthy of the subject; it is a masterpiece of the bookmakers' art. Such creamy paper, such clean-cut, clear-faced type, such becoming head pieces that tell the stories of the chapters, such an inviting and satisfying volume is rare. It comes from an Edinburgh house, and we recommend it to the book-makers and book readers of America.

A GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA. For Catholic Colleges and Reading Circles and for Self-Instruction. Vol. I. *The Papacy and the Empire.* By A. Guggenberger, S. J., Professor of History at Canisius' College, Buffalo, N. Y. 8vo, pp. 447, with maps. St. Louis: Herder.

This work is to be in three volumes, treating of "The Papacy and

the Empire," "The Protest and Revolution" and "The Social Revolution," these titles being based on the character of the different periods. It has for its main object the history and development of the Teutonic race and its relations to other nations. The purely Roman history of the Christian era is treated by way of introduction.

The term *general* in the title is used in opposition to "ecclesiastical," "special," etc., because, although the books are confined to the most important period of the world's history, they contain all the features of general histories of this class.

The aim and spirit of the work is outlined in these words: "As Jesus Christ, the God Incarnate, is the centre of all history, so the divine institution of the Primacy of the Holy See and the independence of the Catholic Church is the centre of the history of the Christian era. Most of the great historical contests since the coming of Christ were waged around the rock of St. Peter. It is impossible to understand and appreciate the course of human events in its proper meaning and character without giving full consideration and weight to these two central facts of history."

As the title page announces, the work is intended to serve as a guide for Catholic college students, reading circles and for self-instruction. The author claims that "in the class-room it will serve the purpose of consecutive reading. The private student will find ample references to enlarge his reading on any historical question of importance within the period in which he may be interested. Reading circles will find more than sufficient matter for any number of essays or debates by consulting the book lists."

Some valuable suggestions are made in the beginning for the use of the book in the class-room.

The lists of books and magazines which the sections include are unusually large. The author very modestly announces that he does not hope to have produced a perfect work, because a perfect history within the compass of this book is impossible; but he does claim credit for patient and painstaking care. This is evident throughout, and we feel sure that the readers of the book will give to the author more credit than he claims.

POLITICAL ECONOMY. By *Charles E. Devas, M. A., Oxon.* 12mo., VL-862. Second Edition, rewritten and enlarged. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

There are two *a priori* arguments in favor of this book: it is one of the Stonyhurst Series, and it has reached the second edition. We presume that all who are interested in the subject, especially from the Catholic point of view, are acquainted with the excellencies of the work in the former edition; we shall therefore content ourselves with

noting the changes made in it. It has been very much enlarged and rewritten in many parts. It has been everywhere revised because of the many changes in laws, economic conditions and prevalent opinions since the first edition was published. Strict account has been kept of the main new books and periodicals on economics that have appeared in the meantime. The doctrines of the Austrian School and discussions on value have been so much developed, especially in America, as to require more attention than formerly. The teachings of Ruskin are now so much studied as to require a place in a guide book to economics. Questions of practical reform are constantly changing, and call for frequent revision.

It is noteworthy that several views which the author put forward in his first edition, and which were opposed to the current teaching of the time, have since been widely accepted as true. For example, that consumption requires almost as much study as production; that combination is just as "natural" a force as competition, and maybe just as powerful; that neither differential gains nor the law "of diminishing returns" are confined to agriculture. Above all, the main and central doctrine, that economic science is essentially ethical, has made great progress. This encourages the hope that anarchy and confusion may at last be followed by order and agreement.

Another encouraging sign for the author of a book like this is the practical movement for some of the reforms urged in it. Such movement was begun after the appearance of the first edition, notably in the legislative efforts to repress usury and fraud and to enforce the responsibility of the employer.

One of the highest compliments paid to the book is due to the *Methodist Times*, which says: "Space forbids us, as does the technical nature of the subject, to go into detail over the economic canons of Mr. Devas; suffice to say that they are arrived at by the light of nature and the light of Christian ethics, and that the Christian philosophy of life is everywhere definitely assumed. We heartily commend this manual to Protestants; it is economically sound, as well as economically progressive and Christian."

THE GREAT SUPPER OF GOD; or, Discourses on Weekly Communion. By Rev. Stephen Coube, S. J. With appendix of Historical Doctrine and Other Important Statements Pertaining to the Subject. Translated from the French by Ida Griffiss. Edited by Rev. F. X. Brady, S. J. 16mo., pp. 255. New York: Benziger Brothers.

At the Twelfth Eucharistic Congress, which was held in August, 1899, at Lourdes, Father Coube, S. J., one of the foremost preachers of France, was invited by Bishop Doutreloux, of Liege, to deliver the evening discourses. Twenty Bishops and four thousand mem-

bers were in attendance, and the preacher selected for his subject, "Weekly Communion." In making this selection he had in mind not only the large audience which he saw before him, and for which he considered it most opportune, but that larger multitude scattered throughout the world which stood in still greater need of instruction on this important subject and which he hoped to reach through other channels. He tells us that he addressed himself chiefly to the second class, and for their benefit the discourses were soon brought out in book form. The first edition was quickly exhausted and a second was called for. The book now appears in English for the first time. The author tells us that it is not an apologetic work written to convince unbelievers, but an appeal to that body of Catholics whose name is legion; who although believing in the real presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament, nevertheless seldom approach Him.

He wishes to draw all persons to frequent communion, and he endeavors to prove that the weekly reception of the Blessed Sacrament is not only pleasing to our Divine Lord, but that it is supported by the constant tradition of the Church. In the first discourse he shows the advantages and necessity of communion; in the second he advocates weekly communion, and in the third he addresses himself directly to men because they seldomest approach the holy table.

In the appendices much valuable historical matter is supplied. We cannot better indicate the excellence of the book than by reproducing the words of one who knew it well and appreciated it:

"The 'Great Supper of God' is a book out of the beaten track, interesting, convincing, suggestive and devotional, and will surely be an efficient help to members of the Eucharistic League, Perpetual Adoration, Holy Hour, Confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament, Apostleship of Prayer, Holy Name Societies; in fact, to every one who wishes to have a just value of Holy Communion. Religious communities who practice frequent communion will be greatly encouraged by the reading of this volume."

FAITH AND FOLLY. By the *Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Vaughan*, author of "Thought for All Times," "Life After Death," etc. 12mo., pp. x., 485. London: Burns & Oates. Received from Benziger Brothers, New York.

The author thus explains his title: "We call it 'Faith and Folly' because our chief purpose in publishing it is to strike a blow, however feeble, however unworthy and however ill-directed, in defense of the Faith, and of the supernatural structure erected by Faith, against attacks of modern infidelity and the assaults of the worldly wise."

Most of the chapters have already appeared in reviews or magazines, but that does not prevent them from fitting well together and

forming a united whole that covers the field pretty completely. The right reverend author is particularly suited for work of this kind, and it is a rare qualification. He writes clearly; picks the arguments of his opponents to pieces coolly and completely; illustrates aptly, and concludes logically. It is easy to hunt while the chase is across open fields, but quite difficult when the game leads the hunter over fences, across ditches, through forests which the sun hardly penetrates and in which the path is hidden with tangled undergrowth. So it is comparatively easy to argue with an opponent who will meet you in the open and use the ordinary weapons of intellectual warfare; but difficult indeed when one objects, asserts, denies and sneers, following no law and ignoring logic. Then the game leaves the open field.

This book is very useful at this time, when the old song is being sung over and over again with slight variations, but always with the same refrain: "Science contradicts Faith." Mgr. Vaughan tears the mask from such seeming learning which pretends to make this discovery, and calls it by its true name, folly.

GESCHICHTE DER CHRISTLICHEN KUNST. Von *Franz Xavier Kraus*. Vol. II. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$2.10 net.

In the present instalment of his great History of Christian Art (which bears the peculiar designation of volume second, part second, first half), Mgr. Kraus treats of art in the early days of the Renaissance. Like the preceeding parts, the book is brought forth in magnificent style, copiously embellished with illustrations, 132 in number. Being written for the people, the author has avoided technicalities, and his book is as interesting as a romance.

When we consider how intimately the history of art is bound up with that of the Catholic Church, the fostering mother of all arts and sciences, we cannot but deeply regret that there is not a single book in the English language in which the story of what the Church has done for art is presented to the eye with anything approaching the clearness with which it appears in the pages of Kraus. There undoubtedly would be a large sale for just such a work as this if issued in our language.

THE SCALE (OR LADDER) OF PERFECTION. Written by *Walter Hilton*. With an Essay on the Spiritual Life of Mediæval England. By the Rev. J. B. Dalgairns, Priest of the Oratory. 12mo., lx., 355. London: Art and Book Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This ascetical work is certainly stamped with the approval of time. Its author, Walter Hilton, died in 1395. His "Scale of Perfection"

is found in five MSS. in the British Museum alone. Many editions of it were published in the latter part of the fifteenth century and the early part of the sixteenth. One printer brought out three editions of it, in 1494, 1519 and 1525. It was published again in 1659, 1672 and 1679. In our own times two editions have appeared, in 1869 and 1870. Finally this latest edition is placed before the public. It has had a remarkable history. It was written by an obscure author in a small house of Augustinian canons in Nottinghamshire, and addressed to the most solitary of all the varieties of monastic life, and yet it has been reprinted for several centuries and recommended as a book of devotion, not for the cloister alone, but for good Christians in the world. Surely it is well worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the spiritual life. They will find it a clear, practical guide, easily understood and easily followed.

HISTORY OF THE DIOCESE OF HARTFORD. By *Rev. James O'Donnell*. Royal 8vo., pp. 473. Illustrated. Boston: D. H. Hurd Co.

We welcome most heartily the history of any diocese, because we believe that we shall never have the complete history of the Catholic Church in this country until the history of each diocese has been written. The number of such histories has been increasing more rapidly in recent years, and the good example of those who do the work is having the proper effect. These diocesan histories are worthy of special honor, because they are generally busy men who devote their leisure time to gathering material for the future history of the Church in the United States. New England has been singularly fortunate in this respect, having recently surprised the country with two large volumes of the Church in that section. The present volume is a reprint from that history and it is in every way admirable: full, clear, well arranged, well illustrated and showing a progress that is remarkable. Those who wish to keep pace with the growth of the Church in this country must study these diocesan histories, and they should get possession of them at once, because they may go out of print in the near future.

GESCHICHTE DER WELTLITERATUR. Von *Alexander Baumgartner*, S. J. Vol. IV. Herder: St. Louis and Freiburg. Price, \$3.75 net.

The fourth volume of Father Baumgartner's valuable "History of the Literature of the World" is devoted to the Christian literature of the Greek and Latin peoples. It is a comprehensive survey of the literary activity of the Greco-Latin world as inspired by Christian principles and sentiments, from the apostolic times to modern days. The distinguished author is here more than ever at home, and tells

the story of the Christian regeneration of letters with an enthusiasm that is truly infectious. The volume is all the more important, since in the ordinary histories of literature the achievements of Christian writers are dealt with in a very superficial and unsatisfactory manner. There is no longer any doubt that Father Baumgartner's great history will be recognized as away and beyond the best work of its kind that has appeared in any language.

APOLOGETIK ALS SPEKULATIVE GRUNDLEGUNG DER THEOLOGIE. Von Dr. *Al. v. Schmid*, o. ö Professor der Apologetik an der Universität München. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$1.60.

This little octavo volume of 350 pages may be pronounced a complete, up-to-date Apology of Christianity. It is the work of one who understands his subject thoroughly, who has read all that has been written on every side of it, and who knows how to express his thoughts with force and precision. We hope to see it soon in an English dress. It is eminently a book for the times.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS.** By *Rev. Daniel O'Loan*. Third Edition. 12mo., pp. vii., 335. Brown & Nolan, Limited. Dublin, 1901.
- CANADIAN ESSAYS, CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL.** By *Thomas O'Hagan, M. A., Ph. D.* 12mo., pp. 222. Toronto: William Briggs, 1901.
- COME, HOLY GHOST; or, Edifying and Instructive Selections.** By *Rev. A. A. Lambing, LL. D.* 12mo., pp. i., 438. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1901.
- THE DIVINE PLAN OF THE CHURCH.** By *Rev. John MacLaughlin*. 12mo., pp. xxiii., 334. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 1901.
- LIFE OF THE VENERABLE THOMAS A KEMPIS.** By *Dom Vincent Scully, C. R. L.* 12mo., xxi., 278. London: R. & T. Washbourne, 1901.
- EUCHIRIDION GRADUALIS ROMANI SIVE CANTIONES MISSAE.** 12mo., pp. iv., 284 [132] 93*. Ratisbon: Fr. Pustet, 1898.
- THE LITTLE FLOWER OF JESUS.** Translated from the French by M. H. Dziewicki. 12mo., vii., 294. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 1901.
- LA VIE DE N.-S. JÉSUS CHRIST** par l'abbé E. Le Camus. 3 vols., 12mo. Paris: H. Oudin, 1901.
- A DAUGHTER OF NEW FRANCE.** By *Mary Catherine Crowley*. 12mo., pp. xii., 408. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1901.
- INSTITUTIONES METAPHYSICAE SPECIALIS.** *Psychologia.* P. *Stanislaus de Backer, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 266. Paris: Beauchesne & Co., 1901.
- SPIRITUAL LETTERS OF THE VENERABLE FRANCIS MARY PAUL LIBERMANN, C. S. Sp.** Translated by Rev. Charles L. Grunenwald, C. S. Sp. Vol I. 12mo., pp. iv., 550. Detroit: Fathers of the Holy Ghost, 1901.
- JOAN OF ARC.** By *L. Petit de Julleville*. Translated by Hester Davenport. 12mo., pp. 190. London: Duckworth & Co., 1901.
- HISTORY OF ENGLAND.** By *F. York Powell, M. A.,* and *T. F. Tout, M. A.* 12mo., pp. xlii., 1,115. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1900.
- HEART AND SOUL.** By *Henrietta Dana Skinner*. 12mo., pp. 308. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1901.
- MEDITATIONS ON PSALMS PENITENTIAL.** 12mo., pp. vii., 163. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1901.
- MANUAL OF SACRED RHETORIC.** By *Bernard Feeney*. 12mo., pp. x., 336. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1901.
- THE ROMAN MISSAL,** for the use of the laity. 16mo., pp. lxiv., 736, s. 102. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- MEDITATIONS AND EXERCISES FOR THE ILLUMINATIVE WAY.** By *R. P. J. Michael*, of Coutances. Translated by Kenelm Digby Best, Priest of the Oratory. 12mo., pp. xxiii., 199. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1901.
- FOURTH READING BOOK,** Columbus Series. By *W. T. Vlymen, Ph. D.* 12mo., pp. 416. New York: Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, 1901.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVI—OCTOBER, 1901—No. 104.

THE WORK OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

THE making of a Constitution extempore is a political task often attempted in theory, but rarely successful in practice.

It took two or three years to get the Constitution of our own land fitted for use, though every State of the thirteen had already a republican government. The experience of the States of Spanish America is sufficient to show how hard is the task of making a national Constitution, even where foreign interference is absent. Our own State Constitutions, with the making or mending of which the public mind is familiar, are wholly different from the work of modeling the institutions of a people. In the American States the Constitution is the basis of national life and the State Constitutions merely adaptations to it of local conditions. The history of France may show how difficult is the work of changing the social and political organization of a people according to theories of politicians, even when attempted by the chosen delegates of an intelligent people. The English Cromwellian Revolution was a lesson of the same kind.

If even advanced nations find the task of establishing new Constitutions on a permanent basis a hard one, there has hardly been an instance in which they have been successfully framed for any people by foreigners. During the last years of the eighteenth century the Republicans of France deemed it their mission to establish republican institutions in other lands as well as their own. While half a

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

dozen of republican Constitutions were succeeding one another between the monarchy of Louis and the empire of Napoleon, the enthusiasts of liberty were bestowing republican Constitutions on every neighboring land which French armies could penetrate. The Batavian Republic replaced the old States of Holland, the Ligurian the Republic of Genoa, the Parthenopean the Kingdom of Naples, the Cisalpine the Austrian rule in Lombardy. French political experts furnished patent new Constitutions for each, guaranteed truly republican, as readily as they turned out new systems of weights and measures. Within five years they had vanished from the map as suddenly as they appeared.

The Taft Commission seems engaged on a task in the Philippines like that which the French Citizen Commissioners tried so unsuccessfully in Milan and Naples. It is trying to mould the language, religion, schooling, laws, land tenures, methods of taxation and corporate life of a people of eight millions within a few months. It is doing all this, not according to the wishes or wants of that people, but on ideas borrowed from the experience of a community foreign to them in language, race, ideas of government and social life. The Commissioners are not men experienced in administration or acquainted with even the language, much less the character and history of the millions whose destinies they undertake to mould so confidently. Two of them are college professors and three lawyers. Moreover, their task is not to apply the principles of government with which they themselves are familiar, but to devise a new system for Philippine conditions different either from what the Filipinos are used to or Americans use for themselves.

The task would appall most thinking men of conscience, but it seems to offer no difficulty to the learned five. They landed in Manila in June, and in November they confidently inform Secretary Root that they have examined many witnesses and ascertained that the "mass of the people in the islands are ignorant, credulous and childlike," and that the electoral franchise must be much limited because the large majority will not for a long time be capable of intelligently exercising it. The fourteenth amendment embodies the judgment of the American people on the question of keeping the suffrage from the lately emancipated Negroes on grounds of birth, color or previous condition of servitude. The ideas of Messrs. Taft, Worcester and their fellows do not seem in accord with American ideas in that respect. Edmund Burke put on record his inability to frame an indictment against a people of three millions after thirty years of political life. Judge Taft and his colleagues feel quite equal to such a task after six months in office.

In justice it should be said that other Americans have spoken as

disparagingly of the common people in our own land as the Taft Commission speaks of the Filipinos, and even more so. Judge Jay, in the days of John Adams, lamented that the majority of every people were deficient both in virtue and knowledge. Secretary Timothy Pickering held the majority of every people was vicious. Fisher Ames, of Massachusetts, shuddered at the idea of the mere laborers of his State taking share in its government, and declared that the property rights of good men would be subverted in consequence. "Men of sense and property even a little above the multitude," he urged, "wished to keep the government in force enough to govern." Even the immaculate Aaron Burr called for the "union of all good men" to save the young Republic from falling under control of the rabble. These sentiments find echo in the report of the Commission after a lapse of a hundred years. They were then branded as "British" in America. Messrs. Taft and Worcester style them American in the Philippines.

It raises serious thought to find American officials pronouncing the unfitness of the Filipinos to rule themselves after a hundred years of popular sovereignty in these United States. One looks to find what substitute the Commission has to offer as the source of authority in the Philippines for the self-government which alone Americans recognize, and the answer is hardly satisfactory. Military methods of absolutism have been tried and are pronounced unsatisfactory. The Spanish rule has not built up any aristocracy during its three hundred years' existence, strange as that fact seems, considering the tales told of its disregard of native rights. The Commission seems to lean to the rule of a bureaucratic civil service which would be selected and graded solely by merit as tested by competitive examinations. This is the system prevalent in the neighboring Chinese Empire; but even for this the Commissioners see formidable difficulties. It is essential that it be administered with the utmost rigidity and impartiality; but then it must be administered, after all, by men, and the Commissioners pathetically point out that the proportion of Filipinos who can be trusted is quite small. They must be taught by better salaries and by "the example of Americans a different standard of integrity." Unfortunately, we are told the Americans who come to the Philippines do not come as bearers of any moral standards. They come with the idea of making money, and they are exposed, poor fellows, to constant temptations offered by interested persons, who have no other conception of a public officer than that he is to be bribed if his price be known. "Men may leave the United States honest, but with the weakening of home associations and the greed for profit, demoralization and dishonesty are much more likely to follow than at home." Considering that here at home in ordinary

times the proportion of convicts to the population is eight times larger than among the Filipinos under Spanish rule, it makes one anxious to know what the proportion will be when the much greater demoralization and dishonesty are developed among Americans in the Filipinos. Judge Taft's only remedy is to "banish all favoritism and political considerations from the selection of civil servants and to awaken an enthusiasm in the service by reasonable prospects of promotion!" It is satisfactory to note that the danger of favoritism or overgreed for wealth is not considered possible in American Commissioners. The Commission has passed a law which "goes further than any in the United States in carrying out the theory of the merit system." It also commends the "earnest assistance and coöperation of President McKinley and Secretary Root in maintaining pure the civil service of the islands." It is well to know that these high officials, at least, are truly righteous men.

The "qualifications by merit" of the five Commissioners for the highest positions in the government of the Philippines are not mentioned in the Report. Judge Taft's are that he is an Ohio lawyer who has filled, in the words of an admirer, more good \$6,000 a year positions than any man of his years in that State. Mr. Ide and General Wright are both lawyers well-known in their own States, and that must remove them from all danger of moral weakness. Mr. Dean Worcester was assistant professor of zoölogy in the University of Michigan, and had twice visited the islands before the war. He has also written a book of travel, in which he roundly abused the Catholic priests of the islands. Professor Bernard Moses was unknown to public life outside the University of California when he was called on the recommendation of its new president, Mr. Wheeler, to help in making a Constitution for the Philippines. One can see at a glance how well merited is the tribute paid to President McKinley and his War Secretary for their earnestness to secure the highest standard of fitness in the civil service of the Philippines from these facts.

The Commissioners divided the work of Constitution making among them. It does not appear from the Report that any of them is familiar with the Spanish or native languages or the institutions established in the islands during the last three centuries. Indeed, the English of the report itself seems to need a good deal of improvement both in style and grammar, but that may be passed over. At all events, Judge Taft undertook for his part to provide for a new civil service, a new land system and to deal with the question of the Spanish clergy. Mr. Worcester, as a zoölogist and author, was assigned the regulation of mining laws, forestry, agriculture and public health. He also was set to frame a system of municipal government

to take the place of that already existing in the islands for three centuries. General Wright, of Tennessee, took to himself the questions of organizing a new militia and new police force. He also, as a legal expert, undertook a new criminal code. A new system of public works and the general regulation of franchises were thrown into his share of the Philippine new Constitution. Mr. Ide took on his shoulders the formation of a new civil code and the regulation of courts, registration, banks and currency. To mould the education of the people on new lines was the task assigned to the professor from Berkeley. Incidentally he was directed to frame a new system of general taxation, and to do it pretty quickly, as money was of urgent need in the Philippines. The general problem of organizing the government the Commission kept for its united wisdom.

It had not done much in the latter line when the report was sent to Mr. Root. It took a district of pagan uncivilized tribes in the mountains and called it the province of Benguet. A Governor at \$1,500 a year, a secretary at \$1,000 and a traveling inspector at \$400 were created and named by the Commissions. The native tribes under Spanish rule had been left to manage themselves under their own laws, paying only a poll-tax of twenty-five cents a head and rendering some days' labor on the roads. The chief changes made by the Commission were to have the head men elected annually and to increase the poll-tax to a dollar, with an additional property tax of a half of one per cent. It was further provided that the provincial Governor and secretary should be the majority of an Assessment Board on the hitherto untaxed property of the natives, and his approval should be necessary for all acts of the elected village governments. This method of combining popular elections with an absolute government, independent of their results, is regarded with much satisfaction by the Commission.

The franchise under those conditions might safely be universal, and the Commission so provided in the Igorrote pagan villages. In the civilized towns, however, it is to be limited to those who can read or write Spanish or English or who paid thirty dollars of taxation annually or own property worth five hundred. As the Commission states that it is assured the great mass of the population only speak or write their native languages, this provision secures effectually that none but comparatively wealthy natives shall have a share in municipal governments. The Commission regards this as a very liberal course, and speaks in severe terms of the "cruel oppressions" of the former governments.

Oddly enough, this is contradicted in a long report written by a German resident of Benguet, who says that the "intentions of the government in Madrid, as expressed in the laws, were, on the whole,

just, kind and fatherly. The Madrid government repeatedly issued strict orders to employ towards non-Christian tribes a policy of gentle attraction, and the Igorrotes were left to live in the villages, into which they were gradually drawn from their scattered ranchenas, under headmen of their own race, and with all their peculiar habits not in open contradiction with a gradual advance in civilization." This testimony from a non-Catholic foreign resident to the methods of the government of Spain in the islands is noteworthy. The Commissioners themselves, while freely applying disparaging epithets of a general character to the Spanish administration, furnish several facts which appear incompatible with the existence of real oppression or tyranny. We are informed at page 80 that "before the rebellion in 1896 for many years the Spanish had less than 5,000 peninsular troops in the islands. All the rest were natives. The latter as a rule remained loyal to Spain until it was manifest her sovereignty was ended." The Commission adds, gratuitously: "This was the case, though the masses from whom these native soldiers were drawn were cruelly oppressed by the Spaniards." One would like some more tangible instance of this alleged oppression than the word of the Commissioners before believing its existence, in face of the admitted loyalty of the native troops to their old rulers down to the last.

How sincere the sympathy of at least one of the Commissioners is against oppression of the natives may be judged from the following extract describing a scene in Palawan under Spanish rule: "From the outset our servants stole from us. Finally we missed a box containing twenty-five pounds of gunpowder. . . . We shut Paraiso (one of the servants) into a room and introduced him to the business end of a shotgun at very close range. We told him that *he must choose between* confessing and parting company with his upper story. He at first denied all knowledge of the matter, then admitted he had taken the powder, but said he had forgotten where he had put it. The doctor stimulated his lagging nerve cells by vigorously applying to his person a cleaning rod of good Michigan hickory. This treatment had the desired effect, and we set out to find the powder, the doctor bringing up the rear and occasionally refreshing recollection with the rod." The unfortunate suspect was unable to find the powder even with these stimulants. The writer adds: "We took Paraiso to the headquarters of the guardia and turned him over to the captain, who ordered him whipped. As this failed to produce the desired result, he was afterwards bastinadoed." All was in vain, and the unfortunate native, who had incurred his employer's suspicion, was lodged in prison and left there. We can imagine what would be thought of an employer in this country who, on mere suspicion, would lock up and flog his hired at-

tendant at discretion and threaten him with immediate death unless he recovered property which he had never stolen to all appearance. The parties who perpetrated it in distant Palawan were Dr. Steere, Dr. Brown, late health officer of Manila, and Dean C. Worcester, now one of the Commission entrusted with the task of governing the Philippines on "American principles." The tale is told by himself at page 87 of his work on the Philippine people published in 1898.

The character of the Spanish legislation also finds unexpected testimony in its favor in the report. "The civil code," we are told, "as a system of jurisprudence in its essentials undoubtedly meets the needs of the people of the Philippine Islands and furnishes a just measure of their rights and duties. It is thought that only such changes should be made as are rendered necessary by reason of the changed conditions in passing from the sovereignty of Spain to that of the United States." This statement is not affected by the criticism bestowed on the methods of civil procedure and the numerous delays attributed to the action of the law. Precisely similar criticisms on the "law's delay" are to be found in every American newspaper on the dilatoriness of our own courts. When we are told that "charges of corruption and incompetence against the present Filipino judges are common," we naturally ask are such charges against the judges of our own land unknown? The deduction that "the number of Filipinos fitted by nature, education and moral stability to fill such positions is very small" seems hardly warranted. The report on the administration of justice in the Philippines by Chief Justice Arellano, which fills a large part of the Commission's return, is a document which in fullness and clearness of information stands much above the average of American legal documents. One is inclined to think that the "widespread feeling that these positions must be filled mainly by Americans" is confined to the legal office seekers of the Commission's surroundings in the islands. The part of the report dealing with the rights of the Catholic clergy in the islands and that relating to the proposed system of non-Catholic schools controlled by American agents in independence of the will of the people are of vital importance. The non-interference of the General Government in matters of religion is a part of the Constitution for over a century. It is the chief boon that Catholics can receive from a non-Catholic State, and they cannot afford to see it disregarded in the islands which have become a part of the American domain. Judge Taft in that part of the report which he claims as his own shows no scruples about subordinating the rights of conscience to political ends of other kinds. The question was presented to him whether the Spanish priests, who formed nearly two-thirds of the clergy of the country at the time of the American invasion

and had been driven from their parishes by the insurgent leaders, would be allowed to return to their posts and provide for the spiritual wants of their people. The right to do so had been guaranteed to them on the public faith of the United States by the treaty of cession from Spain. Its exercise has been refused since by the will of the generals, whose absolute authority has been the representative of American government in the Philippines. The Taft Commission having announced its mission to establish a civil government of some kind, the representatives of the Catholic Church asked that freedom of sending priests to the Catholic populations at their own risk should be given them, as required by the treaty. The answer of Judge Taft, while avoiding any positive statement, virtually denied this right in terms which do no credit either to his intelligence as a Judge or his ideas of tolerance for Catholics. We shall examine his own words.

For the sake of clearness we shall first deal with his views on the right of Catholic priests if members of certain religious orders to exercise their functions among those of their communion in the islands. We pass over the question of their property rights and Judge Taft's personal ideas of their morality, which he ventilates at length in the manner familiar to anti-Catholic lecturers, though, as he says, quite "irrelevant to the point."

"Ordinarily," Judge Taft writes to the Secretary of War, "the Government of the United States, or its servants, have little or no concern with religious societies. *With us* the Church is so completely separated from the State that it is difficult to imagine cases in which the policy of a Church in the selection of its ministers and their assignments to duty can be regarded as of political moment or as proper subject of comment in the report of a public officer. *In the pacification of the Philippines*, however, it is impossible to ignore the very great part which such a question plays. Except the Moros and the wild tribes, the Philippine people belong to the Roman Catholic Church. The total of the Catholic souls shown by church registers in 1898 was six millions five hundred and fifty-nine thousand nine hundred."

The distinction drawn between the American Government "with us" and "in the Philippines" is very significant. It is emphasized by the explanation that the Filipino people are not entitled to the same non-interference with their religion as "with us," because "they are all Catholics." Does the Judge hold Catholics specially liable to have the selection of their priests considered of political moment and proper subject of comment by public officers, while such interference is unimaginable in the case of any other religion? It might be recalled, too, that the non-interference of Congress or Govern-

ment in such matters is not merely a matter of ordinary custom, but distinctly prohibited by the Constitution which he and his superiors are sworn to maintain. We proceed to the further statement of the particular case in Judge Taft's words:

"By the revolutions of 1896 and 1898 against Spain all the Dominicans, Augustinians, Recollects and Franciscans acting as parish priests were driven to take refuge in Manila. Forty were killed and four hundred and three imprisoned and not released until, by the advance of the American troops, it became impossible for the insurgents to hold them. Of the 1,124 in the islands in 1896 but 474 remain. *The remainder were either killed or died, returned to Spain or went to China or South America.* The burning question which strongly agitates the people of the Philippines is whether the members of four orders shall return to the parishes from which they were driven by the revolutionists. . . . The commissioner to whom the subject was assigned (Taft) was enabled, by the courtesy of Archbishop Chapelle, to take the statements of the Archbishop of Manila, the Bishops of Vigan and Jaro and of the provincials of all the orders resident in Manila. The questions asked covered all the charges which have been made against the friars, the feeling of the people towards them, the extent of their property and the possibility (sic) of their return to their parishes. Other witnesses, Philippine laymen, army officers, American Catholic priests and newspaper correspondents, were examined in great numbers, though all their statements could not be reduced to writing."

One notes as peculiar in a judicial investigation that while the claimants of the friars' rights are all definite persons and described by Judge Taft as "all educated gentlemen of high moral standards," the other "witnesses" are all anonymous. Of the four classes called, three could have no personal knowledge of any facts relating to the relations of the friars with their parishioners before their violent expulsion or to their characters. They could give nothing but hearsay gossip on these subjects, and even this the Judge did not deem it needful to have written down. As to the qualifications of "Philippine laymen" in that quality alone, to give trustworthy evidence, it would seem to need some further explanation with six and a half millions of persons entitled to the name. Of the Filipinos connected with the American civil service, the report says, at page 20, "the percentage who can be trusted to handle public money or exercise control over their fellow-residents without speculation is comparatively small." Of the people at large it says, two pages earlier: "The difficulty they have in communicating with the Americans because of a want of knowledge of their language, character or customs would tend to make them silent in any event, and when this is ac-

accompanied by the very present prospect of being abducted, болоed (sic) or tortured, it is not remarkable that the insurgents are able to assume the rôle of amigos (friends) when pressed." It would add to the value of the unwritten statements of the numerous Philippine laymen if we knew whether they belonged to the class that cannot be trusted to handle public money or to the much larger one which dare not speak truth through fear of assassination by the very revolutionists who had expelled the friars and murdered so many of them. How could even a Judge know under the circumstances how far the matter at stake was really a burning question among a people whom his Commission describes as absolutely terrorized? What "army officers" would have to say in the matter as their opinion passes comprehension. Of the class described as American Catholic priests, there were not over four, we believe, in Manila, and at page 16, speaking of the evidence of one of them on another point, the Commission thinks it "probably erroneous." No oaths were administered in any case, nor, as it would appear later, was any attempt made to compare the statements made, largely in language foreign to the Judge, with public documents in possession of the Commission. The naïveté of a Judge when applied to for permission to return to certain places gravely asking the general public whether it was possible to return is remarkable in legal practice. We freely assert that no similar trial of the rights of several hundred clergymen to exercise the functions of their office, as secured to them by the national honor, can be found in the history of civilized nations. Judge Taft's own description of it when he calmly says, "We have attempted without bias to reach a conclusion as to the truth and shall now state it," hardly commands the belief of fair-minded men.

Having described the case to be tried and the methods adopted for its examination, the Judge goes on to give Secretary Root, and through him, Congress and the American people his own judgment on the friars. The case placed before him as ruler of the islands was, in fact, a demand on the part of the latter for the right to return to their parishes, of which they had been arbitrarily deprived by the Military Governor. The Judge gave no decision, which practically left the applicants without their rights. By way of compensation he has laid before Mr. Root the conclusions formed by himself on the expediency of getting them out of the Philippines either by threats or promises. Of their undoubted right to remain under the treaty, the only mention anywhere made is this: "If the friars return to their parishes, though only under the same police protection which the American Government *is bound to extend to any other* Spanish subjects commorant (sic) in the islands, the people will regard it as the act of the Government. It is likely to have the same

effect on them that *the return of General Weyler as Governor of Cuba under an American commission would have had* on the people of that island." This what Mr. Taft considers stating the truth without bias most men will regard as a specimen of partisan special pleading of a peculiarly low kind.

The inconvenient treaty rights of the friars having been thus dismissed, the Judge goes on to give the opinions he has formed from his numerous informants. The only authority, besides his own, given for them is a statement said to be by the Franciscan provincial, but which, on the face of it, has been wilfully or ignorantly garbled into nonsense. Perhaps we should add the novel of Dr. Rizal of some years ago, which is gravely quoted as evidence, though we venture to say it has not been read by the man who quotes it. The Spanish friars having asked the Commission as official American authority for the rights guaranteed them by the American Government, the head of the Commission sees fit to give to the Secretary of War his own opinion of Spanish friars in general. It is, of course, drawn from hearsay entirely of the "witnesses" just described, officers, correspondents, etc.

The friar, as a parish priest, was usually the only man of intelligence and education who knew the native dialect and the Spanish language well in his parish. His position as spiritual guide of the people *necessarily led* to his acting as intermediary between them and the rest of the world in secular matters. At first actually, and afterwards by law, he came to discharge many civil functions and to supervise or veto everything which was done in the pueblo which was his parish. The provincial of the Franciscans describes his civil functions as follows:

He was inspector of primary schools, president of the Health Board and Board of Charities, of the Board of Urban Taxation, Inspector of Taxation, president of the Board of Public Works. He was president of the Board of Statistics. It was against the will of the priest to do this, but he could only do as he was told. They did not have civil registration here, and so they had to depend on the books of the parish. These books were sent in for the cedula taxation (income tax), but were not received by the authorities unless vided by the priest.

He was president of the census taking of the town. He had to be present by law when there were municipal elections. Very often he did not want to go, but the people would come to him and say: "Come, for there will be disturbances, and you will settle many difficulties." He was censor of the municipal budgets, president of the Prison Board and inspector of the food provided for the prisoners. He was a member of the Provincial Board. Before it came all mat-

ters relating to public works. He was also member of the board for partitioning crown lands. After the land was surveyed and divided and a man wanted to sell his land he would present his certificate and the board would decide whether or not he was the owner. He was also counsellor for the municipal body when it met. The priest was supervisor of election of the police force. He was the censor of plays, comedies and dramas in the native language, deciding whether they were conformable to law and morality. These plays were acted at the popular fiestas. Besides there were other small things which devolved on the priest.

Judge Taft concludes confidently: "It is easy to see from this that the priest was not only the spiritual guide, but in every sense the municipal ruler." He goes on to heighten the picture so worked up from the words of the unsuspecting Spanish provincial: "To the Filipino the government in these islands under Spain was the government of the friars. Every abuse of the many which led to the revolutions of 1896 and 1898 was charged by *the people* to the friars. Whether they were in fact to blame is, perhaps, aside from our purpose, but it *cannot admit of contradiction* that the autocratic power which each friar curate exercised over the people and civil officials gave them a most plausible ground for belief that nothing of injustice, of cruelty, of oppression was imposed on them for which the friars were not directly responsible. The revolutions against Spain's authority began as movements against the friars. Such was the tendency of Rizal's chief work, the novel 'Noli me Tangere.' The treaty of Biacnabato, which ended the first revolution, *is said* to have contained the condition that the friars should be expelled. In the second revolution (Aguinaldo's) at least forty friars were killed and over four hundred imprisoned. In view of these circumstances the statement of the Bishops and friars that the mass of the population are friendly to them, except only a few leading men in each town and the native clergy, cannot be accepted as accurate. All the evidence derived from every source" (tapped by Judge Taft), "except the friars, shows that the feeling of hatred for them is well nigh universal and permeates all classes."

Let us examine these assertions to see how far Judge Taft's judgment deserves to be regarded as a truthful statement of facts. It was probably true that the friar parish priests were usually the most intelligent persons in their parishes, and as such extensively consulted in the worldly concerns of the natives whom their predecessors had civilized. This will hardly be held a crime deserving expulsion. The good Franciscan provincial apparently tried to explain this state of things to the man whom he regarded as the friendly and conscientious representative of American rule. The grotesque garbling of

his words which Mr. Taft presents to the American public speaks its falsehood in terms plain to any comprehension. Does he really believe that the Tagal and Visaya villages were equipped with the Boards of Health, charities, prisons, statistics, census, local police, crown lands, general taxation, urban taxation, police and elections, with the presidency of which he tells us the terrible friar priests were universally invested? If there were no such boards, and a glance at the Spanish records under his hand would show him they had no existence, why does he not say so when pretending to give the testimony of the Franciscan provincial? As a matter of fact, the official position of the parish priest was simply that of a member of the local village council. In the sketch of the Spanish administration by Chief Justice Arrelano, which forms a part of the report, we are told at page 231 that the local chiefs, known as Gobernadorcillos, assumed the exercise of both executive and judicial functions within their sphere of action. If Judge Taft had desired information on the accuracy of the wonderful Pooh Bah functions which he says the Franciscan provincial laid before him, could he not have applied for information to the learned Justice. If there was no civil regulation and no police force, what would be the functions of Boards of Statistics, Census and Police? The urban taxation of the whole archipelago, the report tells, reached only a hundred and forty thousand dollars, nearly all paid in three cities. What would boards for collecting it have to do among Indian huts? These questions would occur to any man of sense. They either did not occur to Judge Taft or he preferred not to make them that he might build up an indictment of autocratic powers against the friars on false evidence. If these had no existence, there would be no plausibility in the belief that the friars were responsible for everything of injustice, of cruelty and oppression that a lurid imagination could suggest and which the unbiased Judge cautiously hints are good reason for violation of the treaty obligations of the United States.

Strong as this language seems, it is scarcely as strong as deserved. When a Judge tells us that a treaty made five years ago "is said" to have promised to expel the friars, why does he not find whether it exists or not? He confidently declares that the murder of forty friars and the expulsion of the others by the violence of Aguinaldo's revolutionary following proves conclusively, against the statement of the friars themselves, that the mass of the people cannot be friendly to them and that hatred to the friars is well nigh universal. The same Judge on page 17 explains why murders of police officers in the American service are no proof of ill will to the American government. He says in this case:

"From all the information we can get it seems clear that a great

majority of the people are for peace and willing to accept the establishment of a government under the supremacy of the United States. They are, however, restrained by fear from taking action to assist in the suppression of the insurrection, which has for its indispensable support a conspiracy of murder. Any one suspected of giving information to the Americans is immediately marked for assassination. The ramifications of the conspiracy are so wide that it has effected the terrorism of an entire people. It is a Mafia on a very large scale." Page 17.

Judge Taft within thirteen pages asks us to believe this as the explanation of native hostility to Americans and scouts it as unworthy of credence when made by the whole body of Catholic Bishops and provincials as the explanation of the hostility to the friars. The insurgents now in arms are precisely the same organization that murdered forty friars and imprisoned four hundred in 1898. Does a Mafia cease to be criminal when its victims are unarmed priests whose crime is that they were usually the only men of intelligence and education in the native villages?

We must come to the conclusions drawn by the Chief Commissioner from the evidence just examined. He says: "We are convinced that the return of the friars to their parishes will lead to lawless violence and murder, and that the people will charge the course taken to the American Government, thus turning against it the resentment felt towards the friars. We earnestly hope that those who control the policy of the Catholic Church in these islands will see that it would be most unfortunate for the Philippine Islands for the Catholic Church and for the American Government to send back the friars. The question for the prelate and statesman is not whether the bitter feeling towards the friars is *justified or not*, but whether it exists. It does not seem to us, therefore, to aid in reaching a conclusion to *point out that all the civilization found in the Philippines is due to the friars. Be it so.* Ought they, on this account, to return to their parishes in the face of deep popular feeling against them? It is enough to say *the political question* will be eliminated if the friars are not sent back."

What political question the Judge means is not clear. He can hardly mean the whole opposition of the people to the American rule, though most readers will so take it. That opposition has been conducted, he tells us, by a "Mafia on a large scale," directed by the same parties who murdered or drove away the friars. If he means nothing but the political question of providing the same police protection for the friars as for other residents, it may certainly be true; but that means no more than saying if there were no friars to deal with it would not be necessary to deal with them. The higher po-

litical question, whether the United States Government can honorably break its solemn treaty obligations, will remain still and cannot be evaded.

It is evident that the Commission is most anxious to deport all the friars, if it possibly can, as Captain Leary deported the Franciscans from Guam a few months ago. The Protestant prejudices of the Commissioners, which in the case of Mr. Worcester are shown sufficiently in his book and in Judge Taft's by his report, may keep them from seeing the consequences involved, but to any intelligent Catholic or clear-sighted impartial man they must be obvious. The expulsion of the Spanish friars means that five millions of Filipino Catholics must be left without priests, sacraments or religious instruction for at least a generation. There are less than seven hundred native priests for seven millions of a Catholic population, and there are no other priests, either American or European, familiar with Filipino language or customs except these friars. They and they alone have given the people the civilization it possesses, as Judge Taft himself admits. They possess seminaries, formed on the experience of ten generations, for training a clergy to the special needs of this body of Asiatic Christians which in many points has nothing similar to it in the world outside. The people, as he also admits, love the Catholic Church. Indeed, he doubts whether there is any country in the world in which the people have a more profound attachment for their church. It "is and ought to continue a prominent factor in the life, peace, contentment and progress of the Filipino people. As to use of intoxicating liquors, drunkenness and disorder, Manila's condition is better than any American city of the same size." This is Judge Taft's testimony to the result of the moral teaching of the men whom he is so anxious to expel lest the United States Government should incur the resentment of the people. His own deduction from it is an unconscious piece of humor worthy of Dogberry itself. "The depth of their feeling against the friars (as gathered from army officers, newspaper correspondents and hostile natives) may be measured by the fact that it exists against those who until two years ago administered the sacraments of the Church upon which they feel so great a dependence and for which they have so profound a respect." Might not the feeling be accounted for by "the terrorism of an entire people" which he also finds existing when explaining the duration of the war against American rule? From whom but the friars have they learned this profound respect for the Church?

The elaborate plan imposing a compulsory school system moulded on "non-sectarian" lines on the Catholics of the islands gives further reason to believe that the rooting out of the Catholic religion is a

prominent object with the Commission. Mr. Moses, who, we are informed, is a Swede and familiar with the system of intolerance of Catholics still prevailing in Sweden, has been charged with the task of providing schools for the people whom Judge Taft would leave without priests. As a help this foreign pedagogue has been allowed to regulate the whole system of taxation, as if schools of a new pattern were the central principle of administration. A land tax is to be imposed to meet the general public wants. Twenty-five cents on the dollar is made imperative on the native villages whenever they shall receive the municipal rights which they have hitherto enjoyed under the oppressive Spanish Government. That sum has to be handed over to the School Commissioners, who, by the plan of Mr. Moses, are to be wholly independent of local control and, in fact, to be wholly Americans as far as the higher posts are concerned. It is significant that while in the organization of the first province established by the Commission the election of "ecclesiastics" by the people is prohibited, we learn by California papers that a newly ordained Baptist minister, the Rev. Mr. Brink, has been invited to "take charge of the public schools of one of the large islands." The reverend gentleman's only qualification, as far as known, consists in his being a Baptist clergyman. His case is but one of others already spoken of in the press. The report mentions that "General Otis wished military officers to open as many schools as possible, and that several of the district commanders appointed officers to act as superintendents of schools. Among these are several *army chaplains*. To put Protestant ministers in the place of Catholic friars seems the dream of Judge Taft.

How far the ideas go of the professor who has been suddenly called to mould the whole education of the Filipinos may be gathered from his own words:

"Under Spanish rule there was established a system of primary schools. In these reading, writing, sacred history and the catechism were taught, the four arithmetical processes were attempted, and in a few towns a book of geography was used as a reading book. Girls were taught embroidery and needlework. In the typical provincial school at first a religious primer was used in the *native language*, and later a book on Christian doctrine was taught. The *text-books were crude and provided a large amount of religious instruction*. It has been stated there were in the islands 2,167 public schools. *The ineffectiveness of these schools* will be seen when it is remembered that school under the Spanish régime was a *strictly sectarian ungraded school*."

The propriety of this language in a wholly Catholic country speaks for itself. In the eye of Mr. Moses "religious instruction" is appar-

ently incompatible with effective teaching and Catholicity identical with sectarianism.

His own scholastic methods, as told in the report, are, if not crude, certainly remarkable. His chief authorities seem to be army officers. He tells us that though the employment of soldiers as teachers has not been always successful, and that the schools that have been established by them are poor, still the "commanding officers" are unanimous in urging English instruction and *asking for English teachers*. One brilliant officer named Echols, a captain in the army, assured him of a strange thing that "to teach English to the natives a knowledge of Spanish or Tagal is not necessary." One involuntarily thinks of the experience of young Primrose in the "Vicar of Wakefield" when he went to Holland to teach English and found some acquaintance with Dutch indispensable. The remarkable officer, however, declares that he himself at one time had charge of four thousand American Indians with six boarding schools, and that not a child could speak a word of English, and *in three months they learned it fairly well*. And this was accomplished by teachers utterly unfamiliar with the native dialects. The captain's statement deserves the verdict once passed on Gulliver's travels. Some things stated in it go to the very bounds of credulity.

It seems to be accepted with implicit faith by good Professor Moses, who went on to consult with "military officers, presidentes and other" educational experts to ascertain the exact educational situation and the general opinion as to the educational policy to be pursued. It is sad to learn he discovered a "great diversity of opinion," but anyhow he appointed a Dr. Atkinson general superintendent of education and put out his own programme. "It is not practical," he says, "to make the native languages the basis of instruction, *for this would necessitate the translation of many texts into the native dialects*." Most of his authorities, the "commanding officers," state that no instruction in native languages is desirable and also that there is no need of perpetuating Spanish. This comfortable, if hardly practical, theory of educating a people in a language unknown to them enables the professor to find a large field of employment for teacher friends at home who would find a knowledge of any tongue but their own a task beyond their powers. He sums up:

"The system of instruction must be largely centralized. There will be a general superintendent of education and as many assistant superintendents as there are departments. There will be a system of *local advisory boards*.

"All schools must be free and unsectarian.

"The text-books and *English teachers* will have to be furnished to

municipalities by the insular government (the superintendent aforesaid).

"The present educational system will have to be modernized and *secularized* and adapted to the *needs* of a people who have hitherto been *deprived of the opportunities of a rational education.*"

Though Professor Moses can accept Captain Echols' narrative without scruple we learn he regards Catholic teaching as *not rational!* His emphatic order, after six months in public office, that Philippine schools "must be free and unsectarian" is suggestive of Kaiser William's language to his soldiers. Yet the Commission is supposed to be remodelling the Filipinos on "American ideas." They may be so in the sense that such ideas are entertained by some American individuals as in former times they were by Burr and Benedict Arnold, but not otherwise.

Any person familiar with the history of the English penal code and the attempts made by some English politicians to draw the Irish people from their faith by means of the public schools cannot but be struck by their likeness to the methods suggested by Professor Moses. The municipalities must have no voice in the matter and the schools must be entirely controlled by the irresponsible agents of the government at Washington. In like manner the national education of Ireland was handed over in 1839 to the control of a Presbyterian minister, and it was claimed as unparalleled liberality, after the lapse of several years, that two nominal Catholics were allowed places in a board of seven.

The exclusion of Catholic instruction from the Irish schools was required, as it is by Mr. Moses in the Filipino schools. The ignoring of the native languages might have been taken bodily from the English school legislation in Ireland. The Commission does not go quite so far as to make it a felony for a Catholic to teach school, but the spirit which describes Catholic schools is incapable of giving a rational education is the same as that which moulded English legislation. The will shown by the whole body to expel the only available Catholic priests as "Spanish friars" is exactly parallel to the policy which prohibited the landing of seminary priests or Jesuits in British territory as treason and which sent Campion and Southwell to the gallows, "not as priests, but as traitors to the Queen's majesty." In like manner Judge Taft dwells effusively on his respect for Catholicity in America and praises the sagacity of the Catholic Church authorities while he throws out his low appeals to popular prejudice here against the Philippine clergy as Spanish friars and is not ashamed to drag in the name of General Weyler to help in the misrepresentation. How far his professions in this respect merit confidence may be judged by the garbled absurdities which he under-

takes to pass on the American public as the words of the Franciscan provincial. That should be a warning to all Catholics who may be tempted to put faith in the professions of good will of Messrs. Taft, Worcester and Moses. Indeed, the nomination of the second named, after the publication of his book, should be ample notice that to the present administration hostility to Catholic priests and teachings is sufficient qualification for office in the Philippines.

We may add as another parallel that the system which the Commission favors has a close resemblance to that which the American missionaries set up in Hawaii. Compulsory education on American ideas, a civil service filled by foreigners on foreign tests of fitness, the turning over the public lands to foreign capitalists and general reprobation of the former laws and customs of the native people are all conspicuous in the reports of the missionary agents to the American Board of Missions. They are all to be found in the report of the Taft Commission to Congress. The missionary Constitution makers had their way in Hawaii, and within seventy years the native population has well nigh melted out of existence under their enlightened methods. Fathers Bachelot and Short were deported from Hawaii in 1830, as Mr. Taft would like to deport the Spanish friars from the Philippines to-day and as Captain Leary has already done in Guam. How far does the experience of the Hawaiian people justify the expectation that Judge Taft's Constitution will raise the condition of the seven millions of the Filipino population? Catholics in America are certainly bound in duty to see that the religious liberty of the Filipinos is not trampled under foot in the name of American legislation. That the Commission has no scruples about attempting the task seems abundantly evident from their own report.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

SPENCER'S PHILOSOPHY.

MR. SPENCER has undertaken to prove by what he calls the Synthetic Philosophy a cosmical evolution embracing all things but the Absolute Reality. The latter is the sole reality; all other existences are relative, not even contingent. We fail to find a use for the Absolute Reality, for Mr. Spencer gives him no place in morality; he lies as a darkness on the face of the deep, the negation of light, intelligence and power; and yet he is the sum of physical and mental phenomena. He is an eternal nothing, an

impotent omnipotence, an infinite contradiction. Justly does Mr. Spencer speak of him as "unknowable," for he is "unthinkable."

We extract the five great issues which Mr. Spencer seeks to establish:

1. That there was no external agency in the change from matter without motion to matter in motion; which is his first assumption with regard to cosmical evolution.
2. That there was no external agency in the change from the inorganic to the organic.
3. That there was no external agency in the change from the non-sentient to the sentient.
4. That there was no external agency in evolving the highest consciousness from the lowest forms of animal life;¹ assuming that the change was wrought by a process describable as evolution.
5. That all intellectual activities are expressible and solely expressible in terms of matter and motion as part of the universal movement from homogeneity to heterogeneity.

We do not purpose expressing our own opinion on any of the issues raised—that they include the whole philosophy of Mr. Spencer no one can question—we shall, possibly, avoid the declaration of our opinion on the innumerable subordinate points which are employed as media of proof, make-weights to the media, or matters in confirmation of the issues—or, to put this last in another way, as suggested verifications of the issues. Our course shall be to ascertain whether he establishes the issues. If he fails in any one of them, his theory has broken down. He gives this challenge when he holds that consequences are not the test of a theory; that the coherence and consistency of the thoughts is the standard by which a system of philosophy is to be judged; that this is the measure of truth where knowledge is conditioned as ours is to the merely relative, that is, where it is limited to the perception of relations and the relations between relations.

To illustrate the method we are employing we take the last issue: Thought is to be expressed in terms of matter and motion, if his theory of evolution be true. His corrected formula of evolution is that it comes about by "an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." Is this a law of intellectual activities? Does it in any way fit the facts from the stimulation of the nerve to the sensation and thence to the record in consciousness of the landscape before the eye? Where is the integration of matter there and concomitant

¹ He speaks of sub-vital organisms, but this is meaningless.

dissipation of motion? Assuming that the nerve is stimulated by the oscillation of molecules, how is their homogeneity converted into the heterogeneity of the mental picture? We cannot conceive it as an explanation at all of the fact that we have the reproduction of the landscape in consciousness, and the belief that what is in the consciousness corresponds with something external. Matter in the formula of evolution is the vehicle of motion as in the initial change at which evolution begins. If the law of evolution be correctly stated, and if it be that mind and its processes are governed by that law, a tune that starts various associations and the associations themselves are the parallel transformation of the retained motion of the vibrations proceeding from the piano or violin. We have no connection between the performer's thought passing through the instrument to the hearer's consciousness and evoking the latter's sympathy with the other's tenderness, passion, art, expressing themselves by touches and muscular exertion. All that the touches and the muscular activities could reveal—assuming bare consciousness of them in performer and listener—would be some mode of resistance to the first and a succession of identical sounds to the latter. In other words, the sense of hearing would only convey homogeneity of sound plus difference of intensity in the impression on the auditory nerve; while the performer could only connect the resistance with a certain noise or a series of noises. Even to make this possible an enormous assumption must be made—namely, the evolution from the unconscious to the conscious, from the non-vital to the vital. If mind and its processes could be expressed in terms of matter and motion we must first assume a sort of consciousness—a recording relation between the mind and the senses; but it would still appear that a whole series of assumptions should be made. We should assume the vibration of molecules is convertible into the power of ordering, shaping, creating, reviewing, judging, inferring, commanding with authority, punishing with justice, and so on, by some modification of motion—modifying nerve stimuli.² The retardation of motion generates heat, but how can it be converted into the categorical imperative? or how can intensified vibration of molecules give us the idea of a God or a sense of the necessity of some polity for the successful life of man? Matter and motion are the sufficing terms to express all the activities of mind. We cannot conceive the discovery of a mathematical truth in no way dependent on laws of matter or motion as expressible in these terms. If there were no matter, no motion, the three angles of a triangle would be equal to two right angles. We cannot conceive a pure intelligence

² We here allowed the assumption of consciousness of nerve stimuli to put Mr. Spencer's formula in the fairest way for application.

thinking of any relation but that of equality between them. In the demonstration leading to that conclusion man, who is not a pure intelligence, has no conception of matter and of motion before him. The imagination which conceives the weakness of Macbeth yielding to temptation and the tragic terror of his remorse afterwards cannot be described as an indefinite incoherent homogeneity passing to a definite coherent heterogeneity by the transformation of one mode of force into another, as, say, of heat into electricity. Mr. Spencer's theory is a rigidly mechanical view³ of nature's processes in the orders of mind and matter—and he is quite consistent, quite coherent in maintaining that mind can be expressed by the terms of a mechanical force—but we require him to prove that it can be so expressed.

On his initial assumption there was a period when indefinite incoherent homogeneity was the only existence, the only fact. It is very difficult to make out what he has in view. He assumes a strictly limited homogeneity—he must do this if motion is afterwards to appear on the scene—but though he rejects the notion of eternal matter, we find the homogeneity not a blot on the azure, not tendrils of "mind stuff" swaying in limpid depths indeed, but a something occupying space before anything began to bring about the movement now progressing or retrogressing throughout what Mr. Carlyle would call the infinities.

We must pause a moment to ask the ground for the assumptions that matter is not eternal, that there is a vacuum. He asserts its infinite divisibility; why not its infinite duration? The mind fails to put a limit to its divisibility, he says; on the same principle it must fail to put a limit on its duration. How can he assume on the principle of infinite divisibility a limited extension? Motion must have room; therefore there are unoccupied spaces. This is hardly sufficient, unless he confounds unresisting matter with solid bodies—and this we think he does, for from solid body we derive the primordial and universal concept, which expresses all other concepts, and which no other concept expresses—namely, resistance. Mr. Huxley is too jaunty in approving of Mr. Spencer's conception of evolution as not troubling the mind about theories of creation. First, his hypothesis tries to evade a difficulty; surely that would not be a solution. But does it evade the difficulty when it involves him in assumptions more difficult to conceive than the "unthinkable" positions of the creative theory?

First Mr. Spencer posits matter; where does he get it? From

³ The theory of creation used to be described by the skeptics as a mechanical system; they meant artificial. Mr. Spencer compares the conception to a carpenter fashioning his wood into a chair or table, that is, if there had been preëxistent material.

rather vague hints we judge it to be molecules in ether, but whatever it is, it is in a condition of unstable equilibrium. What held the balance? What, in the absence of force or motion, caused the molecules to tremble like magnetic needles? These molecules are not said to be animated, but there is a reference to the cell of embryology. This inference may contain, if not all the potentialities of terrestrial life, a loophole for Mr. Spencer. The important point here, however, is that the hypothesis demands a period of immobility, that is, the period before change. Matter only existed, setting aside the Absolute Reality; though there was no consciousness, he existed—eternity without a consciousness! he is only an ornamental excrescence, at this stage at least. He may in some future work of this philosopher figure as a *Deus ex machina*, for Mr. Spencer is fertile in expedients, but how matter in equilibrium got there is another thing. It, and it alone, existed until “change” entered on the scene. From that entrance we have the transforming process of the indefinite, incoherent homogeneity into the earth and its living things, the countless solar systems and into the activities now working changes, the universe towards completed progress, equilibration and dissolution. It must be understood that evolution means all this.

It would certainly be more satisfactory if Mr. Spencer told us what he means by the indefinite, incoherent homogeneity. He was very angry with Mr. Kirkman and Professor Tait for their criticism on the formula of evolution; but these gentlemen could have been spared his indignation. They did not hit the blot in the formula. No doubt the words are pedantic, long-tailed, charlatanish words, in our poor opinion; but if they convey definite conceptions, what more is to be said?⁴ Our complaint is not that the words are Anglicized Greek and Latin; we are tolerant; we see such words every day in quacks’ advertisements, dentists’ advertisements, barbers’ advertisements and the advertisements of the professors of such arts generally. What we complain of is that the formula as it stands is either nonsense or it rests on assumptions impossible of proof. We said we would not give our own opinion, that is, that we would only examine the validity of Mr. Spencer’s positions. Well, then, instead of “assumptions impossible of proof” let us say assumptions that have not yet been proved or attempted to be proved.

We are reminded of the gambler’s method of securing himself by “hedging;” he is pretty safe on either issue, of course, but he makes his haul on one. No one has remarked that Mr. Spencer hedges on

⁴ Mr. Spencer’s style is a great instrument for all we say above. He has had unparalleled influence on the thought of England, America and the Continent of Europe. We may have to show how it aided the predisposition to scientific atheism prevailing in progressive circles.

the evolution formula coupled with the appeal to the differentiation in the plasm as it evolves. If he be reminded that the early processes of evolution were purely physical, and yet from these life must have emerged, he can turn round and say: Look at my cell; look how it differentiates, becomes complex, as embryology shows you. On the other hand, if he be charged with slyly assuming animal vitality and a mind in matter conscious or unconscious,⁵ he raises his eyebrows, metaphorically, of course, smiles at your simplicity which takes an illustration for a scientific theory. Verily, the science men of this world are wiser in their generation, etc.!

The entire agnostic school insist that the hypothesis of evolution must be taken as established in its widest sense. There are differences as to the recognition to be allowed to the linking of stages, but the resolution of mind into a physiological phenomenon is accepted. We want to have this last point proved. Mr. Spencer makes us only a relation, not even a contingent being; we have no existence except as a relation, that is, in relation to some other existence, namely, the Absolute Reality. We are an appearance, nothing more; the Absolute Reality, without conscience or consciousness, is the sole existence. But let him allow us a right to doubt him, at least provisionally, though we may not claim to exist because we doubt. There are some differences in the school respecting the method of "becoming,"⁶ but these may be said to be matters of detail. Still the details have their value. Do they not include differences in the nature or the properties of that which "began to become," the *esse*? At any rate, the doctrine of evolution applies to all phenomena without exception, that is, to all mental as well as physical phenomena.

Mr. Huxley sometimes plays the part of candid friend of evolution, but he can at times be very thoroughgoing. He was so in the dialectical gymnastics exhibited when scornfully and savagely attacking the opponents of the doctrine of evolution because they argue, he said, for the most part from the etymology of the word. It must be borne in mind that with Mr. Spencer we are dealing with universal evolution. Darwin's cattle-breeding is not in the play at all. Instead of unfolding, Mr. Huxley insists that Mr. Spencer's interpretation of growing complexity is the true one. How does that alter the case? Complexity is Mr. Spencer's shibboleth, certainly. Complexity is evolution and evolution is complexity; but we have complexity followed by equilibrium, which is the highest complexity, and this is to be succeeded by disintegration—a return to simplicity or, in his own term, homogeneity. At all events,

⁵ We should not be surprised if the Absolute Reality were projected as a bait to swallow the hypothesis of a world soul. Romanes took it, hook and all. ⁶ Feari.

whether or not "unfolding" can take place, it is of the very essence of the hypothesis to formulate continuity of growth. The popularity of the doctrine was due to some extent to its promise of progress to perfection, due to a larger extent to the moral irresponsibility it implied. If greater complexity meant greater virtue in the social body, and if the social body's interaction generated morality, the many-sided, diplomatically-minded man was the righteous man. Violate the ten commandments, but do so in a gentleman-like, well-bred manner, or, as Iago would say, put money in thy purse.

Continuity of growth must have been as distinctly in the mind of the objectors assailed by Mr. Huxley as a process of unfolding. Change would be open to objection as employed by Mr. Spencer—for, after all, we are entitled on their own principles to look at succession of phenomena—but what we want is their proof that the succession of phenomena, beginning with and including the "change" from the indefinite homogeneity, can be explained by physical laws alone. If this cannot be done, what is the value of the hypothesis? The Synthetic Philosophy professes to accomplish this. We shall see. One issue may be hurt already.

The keynote of Mr. Spencer's argument is the identity of all mental processes. This is the burden of his *Psychology*. If he can establish this thesis he considers he has advanced a great step towards including mental phenomena in the Law of the Correlation of Forces. He would still have to bridge the chasm between not-life and life, but he is on his way to unification of the mental and physical orders. There is no difference, according to him, between an impression on the senses not adverted to or hardly adverted to and self-consciousness. He admits, no doubt, as we shall have to mention later on, that there is "a vast difference" between the modes of consciousness of an animal with a life apparently one remove from vegetable life and the modes of consciousness in the higher organisms; but a sensation hardly awaking response is in its nature, he says, the same as the highest exertion of what is called intellect. The difference between the modes of consciousness in a rudimentary organism and in ourselves would appear fatal to his theory. We are not pressing that; what we rather complain of is the confusion of an issue. All mental life is identical; its processes vary in degree. The suggestion is that sensations hardly noticed stand at the foot of the expansion of the human mind and correspond with the modes of consciousness of rudimentary organisms. The admission that man's consciousness has fuller revelations than the actinia's, or of some animal even more differentiated, though very low in the scale, is unavoidable. If he said anything else he would make himself ridiculous. The modes of man's consciousness are different from

those of the lower organism, but what we complain of is the issue suggested—that a sensation hardly evoking a response in man is identical with the consciousness or feeling of the rudimentary organism.

If there be no difference between impressions on the senses hardly noticed and self-consciousness, between a feeling and the intuition of a truth save in the intensity of the impressions and their persistence, the result would bear an analogy to the difference in effect between a single electric current and a number of currents from different points simultaneously poured into the subject to be charged. The physical character of processes of mind would be suggested, though not proved; still, when we know that there are a large number of "progressive" readers who not alone have their thinking done for them, but who flatter themselves that they are doing some thinking on their own account when they detect an implied analogy and mistake it for a proof, we can estimate the utility of suggestion in the hands of such a master of rhetoric as Mr. Spencer. It serves for argument.

For the present we shall content ourselves with pointing out that a feeling, say, is not the same reproduction in consciousness as the perception of a truth mediately or immediately, and with denying that a combination of feelings, sensations and perceptions responding to never so many impressions can be described as a multifold resultant of feelings, sensations, much less hardly attended-to impressions. We shall also notice a curious obliviousness, yet even this is apparently part of his method; that while pretending to rise from the hardly conscious action to be observed in the simpler forms of life to the highest gradations of the human mind he forgets that the attempt to show identity of nature and the terms employed in showing it demonstrate differences more than in degree, even if these were compatible with identity in his sense.⁷

We are not departing from our attitude of reserve in stating that no one really says physical and mental phenomena are identical. Mr. Spencer will go no farther than that they are subject to the same law of evolution, and that mental phenomena are expressible in terms of physical. But it is suggested all the time; for what else is the meaning of the attempt to account for the results in the case of mental phenomena on the theory of increased vibration in the molecules over the vibration of the molecules when the results are set down as physical? Sentience in the molecules we pass over, because it appears to be an explanatory consequence of the increased vibration; in other words, an hypothesis for debate where

⁷ He assails philosophical language as well as the ordinary use of language when he finds a difficulty in words for his sleight-of-hand.

silence will not do. At the same time it is not altogether to be lost sight of, for it certainly is a confession of the weakness in the theory of matter and motion accounting for mind.

But we pause to ask the question, is there any one whose opinion is worth hearing who will say we can obtain the first genesis of mind from the laws of physical evolution? Both Huxley and Tyndall have very plainly declared that the mystery enveloping the dawn of feeling in the simplest organism is as profound as the genesis of a distinct sensation in the most developed. Now, Huxley says that the first dawn of feeling in the simplest organism is a gap that evolution has not bridged.

The difference in the mental processes of the two classes of organism must have struck this thinker as it seems to have struck Mr. Spencer himself, but the first has received it frankly. The mere instinct of self-preservation as directed to its prey in the case of the rudimentary organism must be something different, we think, from what has been observed perhaps in the lowest order of human experience. The movement of a low organism towards an object is something supremely different from the perception a savage has of the thunder which causes him to prostrate himself to the spirit whose voice he thinks is in the sound. It may be urged that what is in the mind of the savage is not a sense perception represented by an idea, but a complex of consciousness; that this complex consists of many elements, each one of which is significant of a phase of evolution in an order of its own and the whole the result of a history extending through innumerable reaches of time.

Such a rejoinder would be an evasion of the point. The point is the identity of mental processes; we can only see this by comparison. We think what is before the savage is the idea of a power above him. The constituents of the idea is not the question, while the thunder is but a bell calling him to worship, whether through fear or gratitude. Assuming that the idea of a superior power was generated through associations giving it the complex character of constituent elements, it may be doubted—Mr. Spencer himself would doubt—that it could be resolved in the mind into its components. The most he would admit of such an idea is that it could be verbally analyzed, but unless he can show that such a complex of associations, crystallized into one conception, can be attained by the very lowest form of life, it appears to us he breaks down. Remember, we must begin with the dawn of feeling, and unless in an organism in which feeling only has dawned there is to be found a complex of consciousness similar to what the lowest type of human life is shown to be possessed of, there can be no such identity of mind as that one must grow out of the other, evolve from the other, change

from the other by internal action. If there be such a thing as evolution in Mr. Spencer's sense, it can only be arrested by equilibration; but that is the middle stage between growth and dissolution, between integration and disintegration. At this stage by his own authority, and necessarily from the force of the words, the slightest motion from outside disturbs the balance and then dissolution begins. We wonder how low types of organism survived on this theory.

We express no opinions of our own, but we might suggest one or two points: If the law of mental and physical evolution be the same, we should know by this time how mind resulted from the antecedent action of physical laws; we should be able to climb the steps from the inorganic world to the vegetable order, from the vegetable life to the animal life which seems as volitionless as the very vegetable life, and we should finally have ascended from the barely conscious creature to the consciousness of man.⁸ But this does not exhaust the list of scientific subjects which should be clear to us as household words; the puzzle of the most adventurous materialists—how a nerve stimulus is converted into a sensation—should be understood by us. Why should this conversion take place? and why the infinite succession of ideas so ordered, arranged, combined that express themselves in all the facts of human life from the intercourse of nations to the details of the humblest family? Why should these take their start from repetitions of such stimuli?⁹ For instance, though it may be inexplicable in words—as Mr. Spencer and his school say it is—how motion is caused, we understand that bodies communicate motion to each other. We all understand that it is a force distinctly physical which produces the change of place; we have the power, the resistance and the resultant in exact figures at our hands, but from the nerve to the sensation is a mystery deeper than the grave. From the sense perception to the world of imagination we can step along a path opening new prospects to us, because we are in the same order of phenomena.

We are not undervaluing a single statement put forward by Mr. Spencer; we are confessing ourselves free from bias; but we require reasonable grounds for accepting views which are a little startling in themselves and their consequences. He objects to arguments from consequences as unscientific in the case of social, moral and political questions, and, as one might expect, he objects to arguments drawn from the apparent incompatibility of certain revealed doctrines with certain declarations said to be made by science. As to the validity of objections from religious sources we could

⁸ We say "barely conscious" in the method of what Mr. Spencer calls "inverted anthropomorphism" to give some notion of an animal life so remote from our experiences of our own conscious life. ⁹ Start as distinguished from source.

quote himself as a witness; our statement seems hard to credit, but we trust before we conclude that the reader shall find some strange inconsistencies in this philosopher, and among them that religious belief has an authority.

There is a point, however, that does not seem to have been taken by any critic, or at least enforced. The great characteristic of the positive school, and particularly that branch of it known as the agnostic, is insistence on scientific methods. The theory must be verified. If there be a law governing a class of phenomena, it must be called in; no other authority has a title to be heard. If it be an hypothesis when it suits the purpose of the school, it must be regarded as a law. If it be a guess, though amongst themselves science men will rate it at its value, the moment literary men, science men who belong to the "churches," or men capable of estimating the authority of statements in relation to the reasons for accepting them attack it as a mere assumption or suggestion, then all the science men rally round the flag, the guess becomes an hypothesis on the point of verification, if not an established fact. They form a close corporation, these men of science!

But to our point. The doctrine of the correlation of forces is called a law. We ask when was it established, when did it appear that all forces were convertible? It may be that they are, but this has not yet been proved. Besides, we have always understood that a law should not be applied to an area of phenomena not necessary to it. Theories are not to be multiplied any more than unnecessary beings. Conservation by energy is not necessary to the mind or to mental phenomena. If there were no mind, the physical forces could work as they do throughout the inorganic order. As far as they are physical they could work in the organic world apart from mental processes. It is confessed no science man knows what mind is beyond the assumption that it is a function of the brain which the matter threaded with nerves could do physically very well without. If all physical forces must be convertible into other forces, but not into psychological activities, to sustain the doctrine of conservation of energy, there would seem on the scientific and mechanical side reason for holding that mind and matter are two totally distinct regions.¹⁰

There seems to be much solemn trifling in the opinions of Mr. Spencer, and it would strike one as somewhat strange he could exercise such an influence on contemporary thought. His reputation is due in part to learning and ability of no common order, to a

¹⁰ Mr. Spencer's argument from "the odor of the insane" and the experience of the connection between mental and physical conditions is beside the matter in the text.

boldness that strikes one as the very effluence of genius, a style the quality of which baffles all description. Though indebted to every one of his predecessors in English philosophy, he has infused into the ideas taken from them that appearance of originality which proceeds from energy of diction. He is a wizard at his spells; his style controls the reader like an incantation. He may carry the latter to a Witch's Sabbath, he may transport him like Byron's Cain over the wrecks of pre-Adamite worlds to the endless magnitudes revolving in space, but the reader feels at home in the orgy, is confident on the wing of a potent spirit. Contrasting the labor with which he is dragged through the morasses of Dr. Bain, he revels in the desert speed of Spencer, "not torrents more rapid and more rash."

In common with the other Positivists he could claim a share in the *eclat* arising from the results of physical discovery which so distinguish the nineteenth century. The changed conditions of life could be pointed to as the vindication of a system which made the senses the test of truth. These, improved by instruments, were thought to unlock the secrets of nature. Well, they have increased the number of facts concerning the relations of certain phenomena, as Mr. Spencer himself would say, but did they shed a single ray on any problem that has vexed man from the moment the mystery of existence confronted him? To the solution of these problems Mr. Spencer has devoted himself; we shall ask himself what difficulty has he removed? what perplexity cleared up?

At an early period he published what has been described as a crude work full of youthful enthusiasm. This is his "Social Statics." Twelve years later, namely, in 1862, he gave the world "First Principles," thenceforth he became a power with the English-speaking world and the Continent of Europe. We have a prospectus of the work he proposed to himself in carrying out his classification of the sciences into a system of knowledge. Critics have pronounced the classification illusory; they have said it was appropriated without acknowledgment from Comte, that the best ideas were Comte's and that he himself had fallen into the faults he criticized in Comte. We think a scheme for the unification of knowledge reflects honor on both men; but we think, too, that the founders of the old universities of Europe, the schoolmen¹¹ and their patrons should be allowed credit for their comprehensive views coördinating and subordinating the sciences constituting the whole range of human knowledge; we think Aristotle should not be forgotten for his encyclopædic knowledge and his transcendent employment of it.

We hear of a reaction from Mr. Spencer's influence. We doubt

¹¹ This is Professor Huxley's opinion, too, as we shall show later on.

this, at least in any important sense. There is an interesting article in the June number of the *North American Review* which would seem one of the straws showing this direction of the wind,¹² were it not that the article in the place of honor, "Anticipations; an Experiment in Prophecy," discusses an aspect of the social problem under the dominion of ideas which look at human life with the calm cruelty of Nature in her work of selection.

But apart from the two articles referred to, it may be admitted that there is a disposition to limit the scope of Mr. Spencer's hypotheses. From the very nature of his speculations this was to be expected. Putting aside any question as to whether or how far he was indebted to Darwin, Mr. Spencer invited criticism by the plunge from biological evolution to cosmical. His application of principles has been disputed by his allies or disciples; we do not say that their objections were invariably fortunate, though no doubt some were so, as Mr. Huxley's statement that Mr. Spencer's conception of a perfect gradation from purely physical to conscious life does not help us in understanding the first genesis of mind from any law or all the laws of physical evolution. From the opposite camp Mr. Balfour's later work was pronounced an epoch-making one; but though it aroused great interest not only among the friends of a sound philosophy, but among those who thought as Mr. Spencer thought, the empire of the latter is not weakened.

We fear there is no sign of this. A denial of conclusions here and there he would sneer at as the carpings of "scholars' mates,"¹³ or of "litterateurs,"¹⁴ or the objections of "so-called scientists"¹⁵ touching the fringes of profound questions. He is such an autocrat that, as we have already hinted, he will not allow the test of consequences in moral and social questions. It may be pointed out that his system derives moral and social phenomena alike from mechanical forces and thus subjects them to the test of verification. No, the soundness of his views must be judged *a priori*. The theory is to be judged by the consistency of the terms as though any good work of imagination would not fulfil this test.¹⁶

It has been very stupidly charged that the schoolmen tried to discover natural laws by the aid of the syllogism and without the aid of observation. Mr. Spencer, an empiricist of the most pronounced type, evolves from his inner consciousness social facts and the competitive value of institutions, but he will not permit an objector to appeal to that experience called history, to that which is to be found in the practical business of government or to that in the

¹² "Great Religions of the World." ¹³ So he described Lord Salisbury.
¹⁴ A *North American Review* and Matthew Arnold. ¹⁵ Professor Tait.
¹⁶ It will be admitted that the consequences to which a theory leads are not
¹⁶ It will be admitted that the consequences to which a theory leads are not necessarily a test, but in moral and social questions consequences may be the best test.

knowledge of local administrators and clergymen. He has not been ridiculed for this as the schoolmen are for the use of the syllogism attributed to them. He finds a constant principle in society inherited from law-abiding human ancestors and, we judge, from pre-human ancestors whose sweet reasonableness enabled them to escape the red tooth and claw and be selected for the propagation of their virtues to mankind. He has the answer of evolution, namely, that all is moving to perfection for the despairing disciple who, seeing how pitiless Nature really is, judges she must go on pitilessly in the future as in the past. How is this? On man's little planet progress onward and upward, while out in the infinities—homogeneity, balance and dissolution proceeding concurrently, a struggle of competing universes forever, systems dying and renewing from end to end of space—or, on the other hand, a universal dissipation melting into aimless force while man's little planet floats like an ark triumphantly in the azure.

That such a nightmare under the guise of scientific conceptions should strangle those who like to be thought progressive people would not disturb us overmuch, but the mischief is becoming more deeply seated because going down to the lower strata of society. In the meeting places of Scientific or Revolutionary Socialism Mr. Spencer is the great figure. Marks and Engels interpret him; Mr. Robert Rives La Monte has his gospel in "Herbert Spencer's little book, 'The Study of Sociology.'" Whether he intended it or not, Mr. Spencer, by weaving together into one work of world-wide evolution religion, society and inorganic change, has captured the tremendous discontent which in Germany used to be the inheritance of the scholar, a discontent now going down to the worker without the scholar's unselfish ideals. This is a peculiarity of the German mind. The students who were afterwards to become professors dreamt dreams of personal, philosophical, political and social environments with which they were at war. Göethe's "Faust" is representative as well as ideal. Though no frenzy of political or social ideas burns in him, he is perplexed by deep problems from which he seeks escape in the Lethe of sensual passion. It is not difficult to guess the influence of wild aspirations, imbedded in the stream of German story, giving fire and energy to illusions. Faust is not only the embodiment of that craving for knowledge beyond the horizon of life which is a property of mankind when unsettled in belief, but he expresses the hatred of naked hands beating against the bars of power and the infinite hope of generous youth that it can accomplish all it aims at. These were the hidden sources of many of the currents in that great and seldom realized creation. But not the Germans only, but the French and the Italians have surrendered

to the sway of Mr. Spencer; these the most logical peoples of Europe have put him in the pantheon of high philosophy.

We think it is time, therefore, that his philosophy should be severely examined as the stronghold of the secular or anti-Christian spirit of our age. We say this, of course, in no hostility to science. He himself admits a *modus vivendi* as possible between what he calls these two great orders of human activity,¹⁷ namely, religion and science. But in any case Mr. Spencer's philosophy can hardly be called the science of the relations between the subject and the object; yet this is what philosophy really is, as distinguished from the sciences of the subject and the sciences of the object. If he be criticized, science or philosophy is not therefore criticized. It occurs to us we have to some extent obtained from him admissions of failure in constructing a philosophy of the universe in which, by his system, both subject and object are intended to be united in their relations, that is, that his philosophy is no true philosophy.

Catholics, we apprehend, look at certain intellectual performances with the indifference with which they regard those religious or socio-religious aberrations which appear and disappear in the march of life. This mood will no longer answer. Men recognize the Church as the great power for order because she is the asserter of inviolable morality, and they like to know the secret of her influence in terms which may satisfy the exacting demands of the critical intellect. Our opponents have possession of the reading public. We are out in the cold. The Church is among our opponents, but she is not understood. They see that all Catholics are not ignorant and that some of the most educated are the staunchest believers. These very readers of the publications of science men have got rid of his Satanic majesty, so the activity of that potentate cannot account for intelligent Catholics being loyal ones. As long as it was believed by Protestants that the devil could promote morality as well as work miracles of mercy with infinite sweetness, sympathy and solicitude, there was no need to seek farther for Catholic good works. But Satan or any other infernal power is no longer in existence to be divided against himself. Science men have dismissed him from the stage; so the wonderful beauty and life of the Church must be otherwise explained, and they seek that explanation. Galileo's palatial prison is a fact, but intelligent Catholics love their Church. The Spanish Inquisition was a fact, but that Church abounds in inexhaustible treasures of charity and sacrifice for others. Looking at the matter in this way, decent outsiders might be con-

¹⁷ We are reminded here of a blot in Mr. Balfour's practical conclusion in his "Defense of Philosophic Doubt." He feels the need both of religion and science. This is as bad as the temporary equality Spencer gives them; with the latter religion is deposed like Lepidus between Octavius and Antony.

ceived as big D-ing the Inquisition, Galileo, Bruno, bloody Mary as nuisances, or regarding them with the contempt with which Mr. Weller, we think, spoke of the lion, the unicorn and the arms of the crown as a collection of fabulous animals.

A good-humored indifference will no longer serve if Catholics are desirous of doing their duty, for there is a non-Christian generation rising. Mr. Gladdens' statistics¹⁸ are encouraging, but outside the Church there is a deplorable tendency to rationalism with which the instinct of religion or, more accurately, the religious sentiment is struggling, but hopelessly struggling, when a cultivated Naturalism plays the apologist of interest and passion. To this we have in addition the dogmatic pretensions of pseudo-science, accepted as true science, scoffing at the claims of the Church to speak as the voice of God. It will be necessary to give some instances of the dogmatic intolerance on the part of representative scientific men—not mere amateurs or dabblers, for these, as one would expect, hardly if ever possess the modesty of knowledge¹⁹ or of the consciousness of their limits—we mean representative men like Mr. Huxley and Mr. Clifford, of real power in the scientific world as dogmatically intolerant.

The Church has not made the attack on science, not in a single instance. We care not how this statement may be received, we stand over it; but men of science, notably in France during the eighteenth century, in Germany during the nineteenth century, went out of their way to attack the Church, the latter finally widening the line of battle to include all religion. England hardly counts, for her opposition was purely political, except during the brief rule of the revolutionary sects of all kinds that sprang from Puritanism. These Puritan infidels hated the Church with the honesty of an intense passion and a profound ignorance.

It is a little too much of *lupus in fabula* to talk of the despotism of the Church and thence by transition to speak of the opposition of religion to science, while "priestcraft," "clericalism," "tyranny over thought," "bigotry," "hostility to progress," "love of power" are among the amenities of science. We dismiss this point for the present and proceed with our advice that a war should be at once begun against false science. We say that the campaign should be opened by an analysis of Mr. Spencer's system of knowledge, and opened in this way. A man versed in the scholastic philosophy should lay hold of his psychology and whatever may be called his ethics.

¹⁸ "Great Religions of the World." ¹⁹ The late Lord Rosse, if he may be called an amateur, was one of the most modest of men in estimate of his attainments. The present, a fellow-student of the writer, is totally devoid of conceit, though he knows more than many a professor.

This phrase "whatever may be called his ethics" means more than perhaps meets the ear. His ethics turns up in his social theories as his sociology confronts you in his ethics. The attempt is to make the problem of both the same; both are evolutionary. This must be admitted by Mr. Spencer himself. We are not offering an opinion of our own; if we were doing so it might be that his ethics and sociology are to be the new guide to conduct, the authority to replace morality and religion. In pursuance of the line of attack a specialist in biology who is at the same time well read in the history of institutions should contribute his help to this part of the work. In dealing with his views of social forms and the origin and nature of morals the various branches of anthropology should be brought into requisition. There are some excellent suggestions in Abbé Hogan's "Clerical Studies" which the reader can interpret for himself in a manner that will more clearly express our views than we have the power to convey them. The difference is only in the direct employment of the suggestions. The Abbé does not refer to Mr. Spencer—that would be no part of the office he undertook—and his apologetics is of the parry, ours is of the thrust.

It is obvious from what we have been saying about this part of the Synthetic Philosophy that an intimate acquaintance should be had with the policies that have appeared in action and those that have been formulated by theorists. Although we have no confidence in speculations proceeding from conceptions of the primitive man and his relation to surroundings, what has been said on the subject should be considered, if for no other reason, to take away an excuse for retorting that the critic was ignorant of a material part of the philosophical structure. If we dared to offer an opinion, Mr. Spencer and his school talk nonsense when they go back to a period antecedent to history to explain the origin of social institutions. History in our meaning includes every trace man has left of himself, though there is an insuperable difficulty in deciding as to the comparative antiquity of traces. A cranoge community in Ireland, a lake village in Switzerland, a cave dwelling in England or France might be contemporary with or subsequent to a politic empire totally effaced by a later one at the cradle of the race, a pastoral kingdom with all the highest elements of civilization blotted out by an invasion long anterior to Hellenic settlements. That this difficulty is on the surface ought to be clear from the speculations of Biblical critics respecting Canaanite progress and its effect upon the hordes that conquered the Canaanite, from the speculations surrounding the origin of Rome and the inferences drawn from words and religious ideas about the men who lived in Greece before the Greeks. But, though on the surface, the difficulty will not be seen

by an intellectual pride that makes a science man a god unto himself. He believes his imagination is a witness.

Assuming that Mr. Spencer and all evolutionists in the moral order back to Critias are right in saying man was at first a savage of a lower type than a Bosjesman or an Australian black fellow,²⁰ what can they know about him except by a comparison with the Australian black fellow or the Bosjesman? Yet they will not take the trouble to learn all that either of this type of savage tells them. If the assumption be sound, a comparison of savage tribes and peoples should be exhaustively made, no matter where they are to be found; whatever earlier writers said on the subject should be critically but dispassionately considered. Is this what is done? It is not. A preconceived theory is fortified by a few alleged facts from travelers who neither knew the dialects of the tribes they visited nor were capable of catching the meaning of their institutions and customs. This is not all; "facts" presented are arbitrarily selected. This is a grave allegation; we could prove it.

Our philosopher and the whole phenomenalist school go back to a time the evidence of which they only infer from evolution and report phenomena of life as though they were eye-witnesses. These gentlemen who take all their data from experience give us the conditions and circumstances of a period which only exists in their imagination. They appear to have come across a few hunters wandering over large regions for their livelihood, preserved to that moment by the selection of nature from her own forces, from strong brutes and from the hostility of savages hunting like themselves. How a few of these could have come together and have kept together we are told—we shall deal with this tale by and by—but we have them, nomads of the most simply animal type. We may concede, but without prejudice to our right to withdraw the concession, that they had some notion of government, some notion of authority and obedience, however rudimentary. Later on one or two animals are "domesticated"—the dog especially. They sleep amongst the branches of trees—their arboreal habits are clearly traceable in the hairs on the arms of their descendants in high places of Europe and America to-day—the dogs watching at the foot of the trees over the safety of their masters' families and the safety of the goats which accompany the migrations.²¹ Next we have settlements; agriculture begins, the idea of property and the idea of religion emerge. We shall have to look at this account of the origin of society and

²⁰ Critias tells us that at first man was without law or order (*ἀναρχος*), a mere brute (*θηρῶδες*). He hits the blot on the theory of morals from society. Laws having arisen, evil actions which no longer could be done openly continued to be done in secret. We commend this to Mr. Spencer and Mr. Leslie Stephen.

²¹ The goat must have been "domesticated" at an early period for the nurture of the infants. The women at this stage were warriors and hunters, doubtless.

morals from another point of view, namely, when criticizing the evolution of man from the highest anthropoid or purely animal stage. But we repeat that the assumptions contained in the theoretical histories of primitive man should be severely examined. The bare hypothesis of a rise from the lowest condition of savage life may not appear to be of much consequence one way or the other. We now know that man is capable of guiding a great or high civilization, and we know that he has progressed from a savage condition in Europe to the semi-civilization of the middle ages, and has attained the place we find him in to-day. Do we know all this? Do we know all that is contained in these assumptions? There is first the rather important question whether man can emerge from a savage to a higher stage without contact from outside, whether from barbarism even to civilization without such contact; but besides these considerations, important in their implications though they are, we find involved in the evolutionary accounts of man and society a menace to religion and to the principle that man is endowed with conscience as a fundamental law of his nature. We shall attempt to show this when saying a few words about the nature of knowledge and the manner we acquire what Mr. Spencer described as, perhaps, the larger part of our knowledge.

The aim he had in view was to realize his conception of a universe of phenomena—his own term would be a universe of relations. We must translate into explicit terms his interpretation of its origin;²² and our translation is that matter, in molecules lifeless, invisible and absolutely alike, existed until finally at the end of what must have been a space of duration in comparison with which vast cycles are nothing, motion as a sort of demiurge set the molecules in activity. Mr. Spencer denies, apparently with reluctance, the hypothesis of self-creation, but that does not free him from the burden of holding that matter exists from all eternity and existed in the same condition until change began. We have said, at what must have been the close of unbeginning cycles, motion comes in and sets things going. There is no time, but immeasurable, absolutely measureless reaches of duration before change began, because any point of time, however far back, is definite and finite. But when we go backward from that to the not beginning, there is no measurement possible. Some very interesting questions spring from this aspect of Mr. Spencer's theory. We regret we have no room for them in this paper, but one of such questions would be the possibility of thinking of such a period without a conscious intelligence existing through it. Mr. Spencer only

²² It is absurd for Mr. Huxley to say Mr. Spencer kept aloof from a theory of the origin of this universe. He posits matter in *First Principles* and tries to refute the fact of creation out of nothing as an untenable hypothesis.

gets out of this by a sort of harlequinade into the trap door of his Absolute Reality.

We cannot be charged with unfairness in our translation, for we are keeping to his text, but putting it into intelligible language. We cannot too often insist that the units of matter must have been alike before the appearance of the demiurge. Where did he come from? We are not calling him motion now; we insist on calling him a spirit of intelligence and will. He must have been there before or have been created. By whom? The Absolute Reality is not even the shadow of a shade; at most he is the ghost of words phosphorescing unthinkable attributes like dead lights on a grave. Then by whom was the demiurge or sub-creator motion created? He was endowed with more than gnostic æons possessed of power; for if the units of matter were of one size, weight, solidity altogether one and the same, motion, by converting them into the infinite shapes of nature and infusing into so many of these shapes all that life expresses, was a spirit of no mean order. In this way we have read Mr. Spencer's account of the process which theists call creation.²³

The "fulness as yet unrealized" spoken of in the foot-note is an implication contained in the prophetic hypothesis of perfection that all things were evolved for man. When *First Principles* tells us this, we are reminded of the excellent wit employed in laughing at the old Christian and the ancient Hebrew view of God's relation to His people. Every reader will remember that the handiest objection of Rationalistic friends to so many of the great truths of Revelation was that no one could conceive such a theory of relations as would make God a doting father and man the spoiled child of dotage. It was absurd to suppose such a Being as God would create the universe for man. The history in Genesis meant that and nothing else. The earth and sea and air and all they contain were made for him; the sun, moon and stars to minister to him. The Great Creator condescended to watch over him, to be interested in his moods, his changes from joy to grief, his affections, his passions, articulate or inarticulate, the wild waywardness of his impotent rage, the desolating path when his power was commensurate with his anger, condescended to rebuke and instruct him. All this we believe, but we ask is it more ridiculous to believe this than that all nature was evolved to provide an unassailable dwelling place for the Spencerian man?

²³ An American disciple of Mr. Spencer unconsciously confirms this interpretation. We are not sure, though, that by drawing out his master's principles from their folds he does not involve him in a *reductio ad absurdum*. He tells us "the inorganic" does not exist "save as a reminder of a fulness as yet unrealized." The fulness is to be realized by change, but change is the equivalent for organism and organism "only exists in the subject." This stilted blundering implies a truth—that with all his realism Spencer is a material idealist.

It is unnecessary to say there are omissions, and not accidental ones, from Mr. Spencer's data for his science of society and morals. He has set the example of experimenting in statistics. We venture to say, if sociology be a science, partial statistics are of very little value. For departmental government they are important, but sociology, if it be the science of society, must rise to the rank of a philosophy; in other words, a synthesis of all the studies that deal with man as a social animal. Truncated by its system as political economy had been when it aimed at so vast a conception, it went nearer to realizing it than its recent supplanter. If we were to say that the science of society is religion, we would be at once put down as a fool or knave.

But what is Mr. Spencer when he gives an elaborate list of subjects to be tabulated and gives no place to the present or past labors of the Church in the work of social amelioration? This is positive knowledge. Does Positivism mean there are no facts cognizable save those of experimental physics, the facts of animated nature, the statistics of labor, the statistics of prisons? We can well understand he was brought up with a prejudice against the Church. Suppose in maturer years his love of truth would not permit him to emancipate himself from such a prejudice as the opinion that from the Pontificate of Leo X. she has been the enemy of progress; he could have taken that period as a starting point and gone back century and century to the age of the Apostles.

With his rare power of dissection he could have separated the elements of social life, he could have gone to the hut of the serf, to the castle of the baron, to the provincial parliament, to the municipal corporation, to the palace of the King and the palace of the Bishop. He could have seen the life of the trade guilds; he could have learned the work done in the monastery. He could have observed how the guilds regulated every detail of industry, settled every dispute, and how commercial integrity was to the artisan a religion, as unselfishness and honor were to the knight. He could have learned that chastity became a realm of thought and life necessary as the atmosphere one breathed; so that it was fabled the wild and terrible things of the forest were tame and gentle in the maiden's presence.

He could have seen how in the midst of tumult and disorder art expressed itself as though all that was best and noblest in human nature found a voice. Great unselfishness went forth to the works of architecture, sculpture, painting in mediæval times. The mechanic cutting the stones for a cathedral, ay, or for a village church, worked for eternity. The same spirit animated the architect whose conception was to be the embodiment of an almost apocalyptic vision. We need go no farther. We need not say what he could

have beheld of laborious, sympathetic, patient life in monasteries. Hard study, endless copying, teaching were a part of silent unknown lives; so that he himself owes to the monks more than he does to the far-off brute ancestors he is forever bringing on the scene as the sources of intellect and virtue. He could mark the steps of progress of the whole social universe of those days, difficult, no doubt, at times, for violence and fraud ruled then as unconscionable contract rules now—slow and faltering steps, but onward steps, bringing to us here to-day that sense of honor, duty, courtesy, charity we boast of.

The fact seems to be that it was easier for him, as it is for all who think like him, to invent a system of morals and imagine a society than to accept social institutions which owe their solid and enduring qualities to Christian morals. We hear of the contrast furnished by the unloveliness of the lives of so many Christians as compared with the beauty of unbelievers' lives. We do not know; we suggest what Critias said about the evolution of morality. We, of course, recognize externally a difference between a gentleman in his laboratory or study and the toiler, in sordid surroundings, home from work that gives no promise of a gracious day, or the semi-detached of the industrious class, those creatures never sufficiently employed and who are drawn by temptations ever to a lower depth. Society is very hard on them, very hard on those gravitating to the criminal classes, and of course on the criminal classes themselves as the great danger. It might be worth considering whether society is not responsible, whether or not she has been the cruel stepmother compelling them to lie in ashes or eat the husks of swine. If religion can do anything for them, she ought to be permitted and not sneered at by Mr. Leslie Stephen; if the priest can do anything for them he should not be ostracized by Professor Clifford, treated as an enemy of the human race. Who are these? Who is Mr. Spencer that he should take it on himself to mould the lives of men as he has tried to set the universe in motion? They will not recognize virtue as a law to the individual, therefore they cannot recognize it as rising to a height of heroism under the fosterage of religion. Yet there are men outside the Church, outside any church, who are ready to acknowledge that Christianity has taken up the potentialities of such virtues as forbearance, chastity, honesty, truthfulness, charity and that which pagans called magnanimity and we the every-day virtue of forgiveness of injury, and nourished them into attributes which we may without exaggeration describe as above humanity. The acknowledgment of this would not do for the Naturalism of science; there was some generosity in the Naturalism of literature, but the man of experiments has the soul of a charlatan; he cannot give credit to a

rival. We should like to know how the contrast between the lives of certain unbelievers and so many who profess to be Christians can prove the theory of evolution, unless it be assumed that descent from brute ancestry is a higher guarantee for virtue than the conviction that the soul came from the hands of God.

That there is much to regret in the lives of Christians is true, but take Christians and unbelievers of the same social rank and let us then make comparison. For that matter, there is a depth of sin and sorrow over human life which must move the reflecting mind more profoundly than any feeling besides. The ambition of the statesman, the soldier's love of glory, the poet's passion for fame are all great incitements to exertion, but there is nothing in them that sinks to the inner recesses of the heart; they are a sort of nervous vanity satisfied by effort. But to him who feels for the care and misery around us, who knows that this is but a small part of the blight lying over the range of man's existence now, and that the same experience marked his path through all the ages since first his disobedient will disturbed the universal harmony, there are but two gates out, despair or belief that the evil is but a temporary one. Man brought the evil on himself is so logical a view that it puzzles one to understand how it is not received as readily as any of their hypotheses by men of science. Aristotle was wise enough to see that, positing a universe, men judged badly in thinking that what struck them as evil in their own poor little experience would not be found good in relation to the entire order of things. Mr. Spencer's era of perfection to which this little planet is moving is not as satisfactory a theory as that a continued consciousness when the lamp of life shall have gone out will receive compensation for pain of mind and sickness of the heart endured in patience here. Any other alternative would be a thought more terrible than the oppression that makes the wise man mad.

We come to the evolution of man. We ask for a little information. Critias was thoroughgoing and precise. Man was a brute until laws made him a hypocrite. This was the differentiation which he seems to have transmitted to his descendants under the name of diplomacy. But Mr. Spencer gives us the hazy hero who left a rudely cut stone axe-head in a cave. We suppose his father was a beast hardly distinguishable from himself in mind and body. This must have been so. From the protoplasm upwards the differentiations were minute. All forms of rudimentary life must have been entered and gone through; in the higher stages parallel developments began to take place perhaps. Nature favored a particular family of anthropoids; this family went on improving by gradual stages, or deteriorating into more graceful but less useful physical

qualities. Why did the arms shorten? This did not improve the climbing powers, the catching powers, the powers of strangulation. What necessity was there for standing or walking erect? The infant does not begin that way; it does not seem natural. What advantage were the looking-upward eyes which made the Greeks call man *ανθρωπος*? Use-inheritance is Mr. Spencer's chief agent in evolution, but this factor would stand in the way of every step of what we mistake for progress. A differentiation survives if it be useful to the animal; but what of one that is not only useless, but an embarrassment?

We cannot get man on along that line; we must try another.

If the anthropoid father were separated from the human son by a mental line so fine, he should be moved by passions, cares, sorrows, hopes with a keenness hardly less than his son's. He should have his traditions about the intermediate stages through which the family had passed to their rise in life; and these would be verified by seeing in the woods so many specimens in whom the tendency towards human differentiation had been arrested. The "links" would have then existed; unfortunately they have disappeared since. He would have done some little carving on fish bones or rocks, and so preserved their counterfeit presentments. All the more developed animals have the rudiments of the vocal organs; this last anthropoid at the door of humanity would have them only a shade less than perfect, his less human ancestor only a degree inferior to his own, and so on. So we could have evidence from tradition and art of the days when the more remote ancestors swung from branches by their tails, flung themselves from heights, hardly touching projections, and landed safely hundreds of feet below. The race was clearly degenerating. Those remote ancestors would be made gods. Perhaps the totems of primitive creeds and of modern savages are survivals of such traditions, but distorted or confused in their physiology by the disintegrating action of time or through the vanity of professional historians or the fatal influence of priestcraft. On the other hand, if the race were degenerating, and here we mean in relation to the energies directed to self-preservation, why should it have survived tailless, talking, standing erect, walking on hind legs, sitting down in the most uncomfortable manner and undertaking a system of synthetic philosophy?

It must be borne in mind that in the evolution of the higher species from less useful types there must have been spent a vast period of time. Artificial selection is no criterion at all; in the first place, it is only employed on varieties; in the second, every precaution is taken against misses and indiscriminate pairing. Mr. Spencer was so sensible of this that he adopted Lamarck's theory of use-inherit-

ance, not merely to hasten the physiological side of the process, but to account for the steps of mental and ethical evolution. That theory is his sheet-anchor. Well, Weisman may be trusted to deal with that factor. But even allowing use-inheritance, the time of development must have been immense, for that agent would not have the same control of the process, nor could it act as intelligently as a cattle breeder or pigeon fancier. The gradation slight from the lower to the higher—we are not dealing with pigeons or cattle; we are starting from monkeys and coming up to men—if at all conceivable, should have taken a long time. We ask why are there no traces of the steps? The gradation of intelligence would be imperceptible; there should be traces wherever paleontology finds fossils of extinct animals; above all, wherever traces of man are found. We cannot admit that there was a bridgeless chasm between the first man and his brute father. There would be no appreciable difference in their habits or affections; the ties uniting them would be the same as those between the son and his own family. Whatever constituted the difference between the man and the brute, it was not the intervention of society, for if the man were capable of forming social relations, his father was capable.

Mr. Spencer denies reason as a differentiating principle. The differentiating fact is the size and substance of the brain. The reasoning faculty is only a developed memory aided by imagination. The process we call reasoning is nothing more than the grasping of associations recalled by present sense-perceptions or by an act of memory purely volitional. Then there could have been no recognizable difference between the anthropoid father and the human son. Why call him a brute rather than his son? Critias was consistent.

But suppose the brain became large and more fitted for higher processes—Mr. Spencer does not allow thought, though he is forever using the word unthinkable when displeased with an opinion—a curious consequence might follow. Is it not the fact that as the faculty we call reason becomes more highly developed it does so at the expense of the more purely animal qualities? Or, to put it another way, the development of mind is at the expense of body. That is, that as mind develops the expending physical qualities of strength, activity, hardiness and endurance, and the recuperating ones of sleep, digestion, and so on, suffer, if not deterioration, a transformation less adapted to survival in the conditions which must have existed in that most distant time in which man must be placed according to the hypothesis.

The answer, doubtless, would be that his superior mind enabled him to cope with the difficulties, and that this more than compen-

sated for his increased sensitiveness to the conditions of environment. Now, this we deny. His larger brain would make him more helpless in his infancy; he would require a longer period of care. His brute brothers would have all the physical advantages. Remember, differentiation does not manifest itself in all the offspring; and if they allowed him to reach the adult age at all, he would reach it broken in spirit, owing to his finer nerves, the weakling of the family and soon to be a victim of the red tooth and claw. There are other points which might be urged in this connection, but we cannot unfold them in our space.

It is difficult to regard with seriousness a philosophy which denies that law and religion are fundamental conceptions. The authority of both is an intuitional principle, and though everything is derived from sense by Mr. Spencer, he does not deny that this authority is one of those persistent phenomena of human nature which rest on some ultimate truth or necessity. Now, if religion have an authority and law an authority of this kind, the concepts of both must be capable of mental embodiment and must, of course, be fundamental. An animal origin for all mental processes leads him to deny that we can have such concepts, or, for that matter, anything like ideas of a general or abstract nature, though he correctly says that such ideas—general and abstract—form the large part of the subject matter on which mental processes are employed. We say “correctly” because general ideas are necessarily the subject matter of every step in reasoning, and certain abstract ones may be the “forms” of sense perceptions. But we think that his term “symbolic conceptions” for ideas of both kinds—general and abstract—is a totally inadequate manner of describing their character. Not only that, but knowledge would be impossible if we could only have symbols instead of ideas. It is easy enough to see how his confusion of mind arises—it may not be quite so easy to set him right—but he will not allow the faculty of intellect, he will only acknowledge an idea that can be painted in the imagination; but a general idea, or an abstract idea as distinguished from a general idea, he will not allow because we have no picture of it in the mind; we have nothing but some vague presentation linked to the word. That there is a plausibility about his report of what takes place in the mind respecting the employment of such ideas and of the chief characteristic of them we admit. Unless the report possessed such an appearance of resemblance to what our own experience records he would not be listened to; but we say plainly the general idea of “triangle” is not a symbolic conception, nor is the abstract idea of “time.” A symbolic conception, if it means anything at all, means a more or less arbitrary sign selected by the mind to mark something, but having no essential re-

lation to that something—just as it is selected to denote an unknown quantity.

Now, the word time is so essentially associated with the succession of events that even if we have no definite relation of time-places at the moment, an indefinite succession is fancied. The same may be said with regard to the abstract idea of motion, some indefinite association, a body changing place, the same with regard to the general idea of a triangle, an indefinite picture, though possibly the figure may be outlined like a particular triangle. In all these there is nothing symbolical; each has a relation to a reality from which it cannot be separated. The symbol *X*, though susceptible of being employed to represent an unknown value, might as easily change places with *A* and become the known quantity symbol.

It was only incidentally we referred to his view of reasoning and his view of general ideas. We suggest, however, that an examination of his theories should be instituted by a competent man, who shall dissect them bit by bit. What remains for us to say must be rather general than would be such an examination. We are simply asking from Mr. Spencer his proofs of certain media used by him to establish the five issues standing at the beginning of this article as the crystallized sense of his philosophy. We have not laid much stress on the changing employment of terms, though that inconsistency with which he is charged might be shown to be greater if we did so. Though denying reason, he insists upon it as the only test of truth; but we are ready to admit that the process which he makes to stand for the reasoning process is the standard to which he intends that his truth should conform. Still we cannot quite allow him to escape on our admission; for there is something so like a policy in the employment of terms and in the denial of distinction between mental processes that it would not be altogether safe to overlook his use of terms.

Broadly, then, whatever cannot be judged by reason is non-existent, that is to say, whatever has not taken hold of the mind through a succession of impressions of such intensity as to be recorded in consciousness does not exist. All we know of existence is relation; of truth all we know is the relation of relations. A judgment which is a deduction of reason²⁴ expresses the experience that two ideas are related, because we have invariably found them in association. It might be objected that this was not merely confounding inference with immediate knowledge, but it was making inference a merely complex idea, and the mind a storehouse of ideas differing in complexity instead of a power or a union of powers of

²⁴ It is nothing of the kind; it is the immediate knowledge of a property common to the two terms that express it.

reshaping, transforming, uniting ideas ; so as to make them give pictures like the *Prometheus Desmotes* or the *Divine Comedy*, or draw conclusions in mathematics, or make predictions in celestial physics, or frame hypotheses to be verified in chemistry. This objection, startling as it is when offered to a view from such a man as Mr. Spencer, is really well taken. If these Titans of science walk about with their heads in the clouds, we are not responsible. A cast-iron view of nature leads to their absurdities. If it were not necessary to evolve everything through physical laws, it would not be necessary to make the most fundamental intuitions and the most complicated chains of reasoning nothing more than a brute's more developed memory.

As we have shown, the greater number of our ideas are such as do not admit of association in Mr. Spencer's sense. Either the universal is made by abstraction, as we may be allowed to say it is, or it is merely a symbolic conception, that is, a symbol like *X* or *Y*, that is to say, no conception at all. There has been a good deal of fencing as to whether the word "adequate" might not be used as an epithet qualifying Mr. Spencer's statement that we can have no conception of God because we can have no conception of His attributes. A finite intelligence cannot grasp them. Any such qualification is not necessary, or rather it would concede his thesis at least impliedly. It is rather better to ascertain whether his psychology starts from sound principles than to answer objectionable positions by restrictions like the word "adequate." His utter misrepresentation of reason and the reasoning faculty affords ground for doubting his genesis and nature of ideas, not merely abstract or general, but ideas for which a singular name stands. In point of fact, admitting that we cannot have an "adequate" conception of "infinity," "eternity," "omnipotence," and so on, it appears to us the acceptance of Locke's theory of their formation is improved by Mr. Spencer into a denial of their existence. They are "unthinkable," and therefore they do not exist.

We must return to the brutes. They have "emotions;" but they have memory and imagination. Mr. Spencer gives them conceptions, at least rudimentary, of space, time, motion, and necessarily must give them the primordial concept, resistance.²⁵ Mr. Sutherland, who must be taken as an interpreter of the master, speaks of the "sympathy" of brutes as the basis of altruism, and Mr. Spencer attributes all moral and social feelings to experiences inherited from brute ancestors through the human ones. There is one very strange conclusion—it may be called irrelevant and even frivolous—that granting the brute's equipment as just described, he need not trouble himself about a future state. As a matter of fact he does not ; this

²⁵ So Mr. Spencer calls it.

of course will be at once admitted, for whatever question there may be as to his having ideas of class,²⁶ there is none concerning his opinions on the immortality of the soul. But, then, man has no evidence that his soul will outlive the body, or that, which is a correlative of the proposition, there is a future state. We must take things calmly.

It is very true Mr. Spencer places all such knowledge as we possess in experiences derived from sense. Clearly the brute could not from this source obtain the idea of a future state, and he has no other avenue; he is in the same condition as man as to knowledge of it. But is the condition of both the same? The brute has no idea of it at all; we are inclined to think he has no idea beyond the present moment. Without looking at brutes, as in Descartes' sense, automata—though mistaken as that philosopher was in his estimate of experience, he has been too severely criticized by comparing his animals to animated chairs and tables—we submit that even those acts which appear as proceeding from foresight in the lower animals are present impulses, like the succession of steps to secure their prey. Mankind has a dread of or belief in a future state, that is, much more than the idea of it. Mr. Huxley's test is an unfortunate one; if he could not recall from the other world or arrest on his way to it the friend he valued by however great an effort of his will, he could not make the soul survive by as great an effort when the time of separation came. There is no connection between the two efforts of will; they are directed to different objects, over one of which he might have a compelling influence conceivably, over the other of which he could not conceivably have a compelling influence.²⁷ So despite Mr. Huxley, we insist that mankind has a persistent conviction that something in him survives the body. Our science men recognize it in their primitive man. All their theories of the origin of religion assume it. Whether he learns it from dreams revealing himself to himself at a distance from where his body lies in sleep, or revealing to him the apparitions of the dead who visit him in his dreams, the idea and the conviction are there. They persist in all the religions; they are said to be the underlying substance of all of them, however various in doctrine, ceremonial and influence. But a persistence in belief of this kind is, according to Mr. Spencer, proof of an ultimate fact; so we have here, according to his principles, something that not merely distinguishes man from the brutes, something not referrible to sense perceptions, but we have the most plausible of all the reasons, given since modern science made materialism the fashionable hypothesis, for the conclusion that

²⁶ The instinct or sense of kind is not the same. ²⁷ This queer statement shatters the theory of will being merely the balance of attraction.

the doctrine of the immortality of the soul does not contain as a necessary implication the immortality of all other living things.

As we cannot get all our convictions from animal sources, it is possible that the processes of human reasoning are not obtained from animal processes. If the syllogism be the form to which all sound reasoning must submit, all deliverances of reason must be expressible by it. Mr. Spencer says that it "fails utterly" to express any of them; this opinion is too important to be passed over, but our space gives us no choice. The policy of his philosophy depends upon it; but what is more to the purpose—his own trustworthiness is weighed and found wanting by it. We charge him with resolving processes of inference into successions of concepts. It might be sufficient to say that we "derive"²⁸ certain ideas from observing such successions, but we could not draw the inference led up to by the word "therefore." However, among the deliverances of reason which the syllogism cannot express he includes such intuitions as the axioms of Euclid. This is more than amazing. The notion he intends to convey by this pronouncement is that relations seen by the intellect are associations derived from sense experience. As usual, the prehuman ancestor's experiences account for these intuitions as they do for the rules of morality. One is in a labyrinth, from which it is easy enough to break forth if common sense (not the metaphysical, but plain common sense) presided. But we might be compared to a bull in a china shop if we got out by treating the involutions as imaginary boundaries; we have, therefore, to keep the paths. Things which are equal to the same are equal to one another, set down as an inference by Mr. Spencer, is one of those axioms which children find in the front page of their Euclids, and which are similar to those contained in the old Logical tracts as the conditions precedent to the elementary study of the science.

It is a misrepresentation of a very remarkable kind. The axioms were supposed to be recognized by the learner as fundamental principles of knowledge before he entered on the subject. They were never referred to afterwards. The lengthened and elaborate rules for the various figures of the syllogism supposed them part of the learner's mental furniture. He compared Lord Salisbury for criticizing some of the pretensions of the sensational school to the savage who makes a deity in order to chastise him—what he meant was that Lord Salisbury invented opinions for the school and then proceeded to refute them. Well, we charge himself with the method of attack attributed to Lord Salisbury. Either Mr. Spencer does not know what a syllogism is, either he thinks intuitions are inferences—in

²⁸ Elicit would be the more correct word because, say, time is not derived from succession, but elicited by the perception of it.

other words, that intuitions are not intuitions—or else by an appearance of acuteness and a parade of considerable knowledge of mental science he has tried to throw dust in the eyes of his readers. He makes the ordinary proposition, which logicians call a judgment, a deliverance of reason that cannot be put into the form of a syllogism. We are not going to waste time over this fetish of the angry philosopher; no one but himself has ever pretended that that which is but a step in an argument is the whole argument. The judgment may have been the conclusion of a previous syllogism, but when it becomes a premiss it holds the authority of an intuition; it is no longer inferential knowledge; it belongs to the higher form of truth, immediate knowledge. And here we may throw out a notion for what it is worth: does Mr. Spencer suppose that mediate knowledge is of a higher kind, carries a greater certainty than immediate?

In *First Principles*, in order to prepare the way for proving the theistic conception of God unthinkable, Mr. Spencer begins to say how we have, or think we have, an idea of the earth, or of all organic beings. What conception do we form of the earth? he asks; and he admits that the name calls up "some state of consciousness." "We have learnt by indirect methods that the earth is a sphere; we have formed models proximately representing its shape and the distribution of its parts. . . . Such perception as our eyes give us of the earth's surface we couple with the conception of a sphere. And thus we form of the earth not a conception properly so called, but a symbolic conception."

We deny very distinctly that his own account of the acquisition of the idea of the earth makes the conception symbolic. We can, he admits, obtain a true conception of the globe before us; that is the model, with its distribution of land and water. The reason we cannot grasp the conception of the earth is its vastness. Now he himself seems to set the limit to our conception of God at the inability to pass the finite. The greatness of the attributes of God, if finite, would be conceivable or thinkable, as Mr. Spencer would say in the scientific jargon which imposes like the sonorous platitudes of Carlyle. If the idea be unthinkable because God's attributes are unlimited, the idea of God would be thinkable if the attributes, however much they surpassed those we associate with humanity, were finite. We insist that by his own tests we can form as definite an idea of the earth as of the terrestrial globe over whose continents and oceans we pass our hands. The gradual mode of acquisition, we submit, has nothing to do with the greater or less definiteness of the concept, though of course the gradual mode of acquisition has everything to do with its greater or less completeness as a subject of attributes.

The confusion arises from his denial of the intellectual faculty.
VOL. XXVI—4.

His measure of "a conception properly so called" is the power of the imagination to picture it; we ask first what constitutes the difference in conceivability between the artificial globe and the earth? He replies the immensity of the one. Second, we ask in what way is a universal idea "not actually conceived?" Everything man thinks about has to do in some degree with such ideas; and whenever he lifts himself from the narrow considerations of particulars he has to do with such ideas. They must be "actually conceived to enable him to do this—actually conceived as in some degree corresponding to the realities they stand for."²⁹ These ideas are clear in the intellect as the products of it, though incapable of imaginative representation; they are conformable to the realities they stand for to the extent of the mind's knowledge of these realities; nor is there a school of mental philosophy which has ever questioned the belief in such conformity.

We have most inadequately dealt with this dream of a dream; we mean the philosophy of Mr. Spencer. We have no knowledge, we have no God, no conscience, but we are promised an era of human perfection. The imagination of a period ere change began, that is the period of "the being" before the "becoming" disturbed the motionless silence of eternity, is more fantastic than any stuff that dreams are made of, more airy than gossamer, less substantial than threads of moonlight woven for Titania. For this reflection of a mirage we are asked to throw away everything that makes life valuable, the authority of conscience over the powers of the intellect and heart. We are no longer to live in the light of loyal performance of duty—because it is duty, not merely because it has relation to others, but because it is duty, always duty, to be thought of as such at every moment of our lives, in the privacy of the secret chamber as well as in the market-place, and alike in the desert or the city. We are to surrender to the social body the keeping of conscience, because conscience is its child, its emanation, effluence. Then shall dawn the happy world when professors shall rule in the high departments of State, inferior schoolmasters in the lower ones, when favorite pupils shall be the police, when in theory property shall be in common, in practice the possession of the few. But after a few years of it men of science with a vestige of humanity will call for the dissolution of a universe accursed, and plain men, outraged in their affections by learned licentiousness, will look around them for the banished God to bring back the old order of belief, fidelity, purity, justice.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

²⁹ Concept and idea are not happy words to express what is in the mind when the object there is expressed by a universal.

HARNACK AND HIS CRITICS ON THE "DE ALEATORIBUS."

WITH the sole exception of the higher criticism of the Scriptures, there is probably no branch of ecclesiastical learning on which more labor has been spent during the last fifty years than the study of the documents of the primitive Church. We know so little of the growth and development of the Christian communities in the earliest times, of their internal government, of the relation of their members to the external world, that any additional evidence which we can obtain is of no small value. Moreover, the twilight of the first two centuries is at the present time the chosen ground for controversy. Every line, every expression of the writers of that period is eagerly scanned by rationalist, Protestant, and Catholic scholars, in the hope of finding some fresh support for their respective doctrines. Hence the publication by Professor Harnack in 1888 of his commentary on the "*De Aleatoribus*"—a small treatise preserved among the works of S. Cyprian, but which has long been known not to have come from his pen—aroused the very greatest interest among all students of Church history. In this commentary the learned professor undertook to show that the work in question was the oldest ecclesiastical document in the Latin language, for it was nothing less than a homiletic treatise addressed to the bishops and the faithful by Pope Victor I. (192-202); in short, that we possess in it a Papal encyclical of the second century.

Till the publication of Harnack's comment the "*de Aleatoribus*" had rested in comparative obscurity. Bellarmine, in his "*De Script. Eccles.*" (1612), notices that the author was evidently not S. Cyprian, but a Pope. It seems, however, that it is to Nicholas Faber (ob. 1612) that we must allow the credit of having been the first to detect the indication of a Papal origin; for Rigaltius, who included in his edition of S. Cyprian (Paris, 1648) some annotations of Faber's, gives the following note to chapter vii.; "*Nic: Faber notat hunc tractatum non esse Cypriani: nam ex hoc loco apparere alicujus Pontificis Romani scriptum esse?*" But save for a few scattered notices, the work had shared the fate of the other pseudo-Cyprianic writings and had been neglected by the commentators.

It is needless to say that so important a discovery gave rise to a controversy among continental scholars which may almost claim to form a small literature of its own. At first the conclusions advanced in the commentary were received with no little favor, and several eminent Catholic scholars—among others Fr. Grisar, S. J., and

Professor Le Jay—held that the case was proved. But before long the arguments on which the theory was based were submitted to a rigorous criticism by Professor Funk, of Tübingen; and from that time the majority of those who had a right to be heard pronounced themselves unfavorably to Harnack's view. It must, however, be owned that when it came to giving a definite answer to the questions as to authorship and date, the opinions of Professor Harnack's critics were widely divergent.¹ The discussion was for the most part carried on in reviews and periodicals. Separate editions of the "*de Aleatoribus*" were, however, published by Hilgenfeld, Miodonski and the members of the Louvain ecclesiastical history society.² Of these Hilgenfeld regards it as unquestionable that the expressions of the author imply a claim to be Pope, but holds that the rigorist doctrine contained in the work makes it no less certain that the writer was not the true occupant of the chair of Peter, but a Novatian anti-pope. Hence he assigns it confidently to that Novatian Bishop Acesius who was present at the Council of Nicaea. Our readers may possibly recall the story of how he was asked by the Emperor Constantine to explain the difference between his tenets and the doctrines of the Church; and how, when the Emperor had heard his exposition of the stern views of the rigorists, he replied: "Get your ladder, Acesius, and climb up to heaven by yourself." This theory of Professor Hilgenfeld lessens the value of his work; for Acesius is not mentioned by Socrates as anti-pope, but as one of the Novatian bishops of Constantinople. We know nothing of any Novatian anti-popes besides the founder of the schism himself. Miodonski's edition, as was to be expected from that learned classical scholar, aims at restoring as far as possible the corrupt text of the work to its original form. To do this was a task requiring very special qualifications, as the treatise is written in late colloquial Latin. He holds that the author must have been one of the Popes between 250 A. D. and 350 A. D. The writers in the Louvain edition incline on the whole to adopt the same view.

Notwithstanding the wide divergence of opinion which exists among authorities, it seems to the present writer that a careful consideration of the facts and arguments adduced may enable us to arrive at certain definite conclusions about the work. It would be beyond the scope of this paper to touch on all the questions, some of them of great interest, which have afforded material for investiga-

¹ A full bibliography of the subject may be found in Ehrhard's "*Altchristliche Literatur und ihre Erforschung von 1894-1900*." Ehrhard gives it as his opinion that the controversy cannot yet be regarded as finally settled. ² Hilgenfeld: "*Libellus de Aleatoribus*" (Freiburg, 1899); Miodonski: "*Anonymus adversus Aleatores*" (Erlangen, 1899); "*Etude critique sur l'opuscule 'de Aleatoribus,'*" par les membres du séminaire d'histoire ecclésiastique établi à l'université de Louvain (Louvain, 1891).

tion. Hence after some account of the work itself and of the sources from which our knowledge of it is derived, we shall simply deal with (1) its nature and purpose, (2) the question of its Papal origin and (3) its date.

The treatise is not found in the old MSS. of Cyprian's writings which we possess, nor in the ancient catalogue of his works dating from 359 A. D. discovered by Mommsen. There are, however, four MSS. of importance in which it has a place. Of these, one, the Munich manuscript (M) dates from the ninth century, the Troyes MS. (Q) is of the eighth or the ninth century, while those preserved at Ratisbon (T) and Paris (D) are assigned to the tenth and ninth centuries respectively. These all belong to what has been termed by Hartel the second family of Cyprianic MSS. Besides these four there are a certain number of manuscripts of later date; but they do not differ in any important particulars from the earlier authorities, and are manifestly derived from the same source. The *editio princeps* of the "de Aleatoribus" is the edition of S. Cyprian's works published by Morel at Paris in 1564; we have no record of the authority which he followed. A careful comparison reveals the fact that the four MSS. are all derived from a common archetype. This we may assume to have been extant in the eighth century;³ hence this common archetype is the sole source from which the work has come down to us.

Our four authorities differ to some extent among themselves. M, Q, and T, are somewhat closely related; but the Paris manuscript diverges from them in many places. Hartel in his edition of S. Cyprian has preferred to follow the Paris MS., and Harnack decides even more definitely for its readings. Miodonski is, however, no less unhesitating in his preference for the group M, Q, T, and as it seems to us, on good grounds. He shows that these three manuscripts in many places have preserved forms which, though at first sight may appear mere blunders, are really characteristic of the Latin in which the work was written, viz., the vulgar Latin of daily life. The Paris manuscript, on the other hand, again and again replaces these forms by their classical equivalents.⁴ Harnack, it must be confessed, has declared himself ("Texte und Untersuch," 1900, pp.

³ Such is the conclusion of Hartel in his edition of S. Cyprian, Vol. III., p. xxxiv. *Exstitit igitur saeculo octavo codex litteris uncialibus scriptura continua exaratus.* ⁴ One case in which the group M, Q, T has preserved for us what is evidently the right reading is sufficiently interesting to merit separate mention. At the beginning of chapter viii. D reads, "*scientes quoniam furor iste maleficus et venenarius est, sed iterum in die iudicii igne rotante torquebitur.*" M, Q, T read, "*scientes quoniam foris maleficus et venenarius et iterum in die iudicii igne rotante torqueri,*" a reading which appears hopeless till it is observed that it contains two quotations from the Apocalypse, and should be translated, "Knowing that 'without are criminals and prisoners' (Apoc. xxii., 15): and moreover that 'on the day of judgment they will be tormented on the wheel of fire.'" (Apoc. xiv., 10).

112 and seqq) still unconvinced on the question of the respective value of our authorities; but he does not bring forward any argument to meet the reasoning of his opponent.

The point is of some interest even to those who are not specially concerned with questions of philology. For this small tract, which only extends to some 250 lines of printed matter and would scarcely occupy more than six pages of this review, is one of the few documents we possess composed in the form of Latin used when that tongue was first employed as the ecclesiastical language. The Latin of the "*de Aleatoribus*" would surprise those who have never made acquaintance with other than classical models. It is, as we have said, the dialect of the common populace, and it brings home to us somewhat forcibly that the laws of Latin syntax were not scrupulously observed in ordinary life. We find such forms as "*parentorum*" for "*parentum*," "*tuemur*" used as a passive verb, "*perdet*" as a present tense, "*a Dei servos*," "*ab illos mores*" for "*a Dei servis*," "*ab illis moribus*" and the like. In addition to this there are a few forms used which are recognized as characteristic of the Latin employed in the province of Africa. It is not quite the only document in this *lingua rustica* that we possess. Preserved among the letters of S. Cyprian are five letters which are now known to have been originally composed in the same dialect. And it is important to observe that one of them is a formal missive from the Roman to the Carthaginian clergy, showing us that it was so completely the ordinary language of the Roman Christians of that date—250 A. D.—that the clergy did not scruple to use it in an official document.

But if the language is somewhat uncouth, the sequence of thought which connects the eleven chapters into which the work is divided is perfectly clear and logical. The author says what he wishes to say with uncompromising directness. This will appear plainly from the following brief analysis:

Chapters 1 to 4 form an exordium in which the writer dwells on the grave responsibility imposed on him as a Bishop, since if he neglect to correct the faults of his flock he will most assuredly be himself punished by Christ (cc. 1-4). From this consideration he passes in the next five chapters to the actual sin with which he desires to deal. Gambling is one of the ways in which the devil catches those who have escaped from his snares (c. 5). The gaming table is the natural home of a whole catalogue of sins; it leads men to perjury, hatred, the scattering of ancestral wealth, and further even to dissolute living; for the gambling hell is only too often a brothel also (c. 6). The main indictment is then preferred—that gambling is inseparably connected with idolatry. This is proved

by an account of the invention of the practice. A man of great attainments in learning invented the dicing-board by the direct inspiration of the devil; to the images of this wicked man the gamblers pay divine honor (c. 7). A Christian who gambles has ceased to be a Christian, and has become a pagan; for even if he does not formally sacrifice, he is a partaker in the sin (c. 8). The ninth chapter sums up the last three in a piece of passionate invective. The tenth is of peculiar importance. In it we are assured that the Scriptures warn us that while for some sins there is forgiveness there is none for offenses against God. The work then concludes with a peroration (c. 11), in which Christians guilty of this sin are exhorted to put their riches to a better use; instead of scattering them at the gaming table to lay them in the presence of Christ, the angels and the martyrs on the table of the Lord, and by distributing them to the poor to lay up a treasure in heaven.

It will, perhaps, be well to quote *in extenso* the two passages in the tract which have given rise to most discussion—the opening sentences in which the author speaks of the eminence of his own position and the chapter in which he tells us that for sins against God there is no forgiveness. Father Ryder, of the Oratory, indeed gives it as his opinion that had it not been for these two passages we should not have waited so long for commentaries on the "de Aleatoribus;" but that while Protestants were deterred by the testimony to Papal claims, Catholics were no less daunted by the difficulty of explaining rigorist doctrine in the mouth of a Pope.⁵ The first chapter runs as follows: "A heavy charge is laid upon us, fellow-Christians, the care of the whole brotherhood. It is made yet heavier through the reckless wickedness of abandoned men who are drawing others into crime and involving themselves in the snares of death.⁶ It is gamblers to whom I refer. The fatherly goodness of God has bestowed on us the authority of the Apostolate; of His heavenly mercy He has ordained that we should occupy the chair by which we represent the Lord; through our predecessor we have as ours that source of the true apostolate on which Christ founded His Church, and have received authority to bind and loose, and with due regard to reason to forgive sins. And on these very grounds we are warned by the doctrine of salvation to take heed, lest if we constantly overlook the faults of sinners we suffer with them a like penalty."

The following is the passage (c. 10) which is said to contain a rigorist doctrine: "The Lord says in the Gospel that for a sin

⁵ *Dublin Review*, 1880, July and October, p. 84. ⁶ We here adopt Miodonaki's emendation "ex saevâ perditorum hominum audaciâ, id est aleatorum, qui alios ad nequitiam se in laqueum mortis demergunt." The reading of the MSS. "et rea perditorum omnium audaciâ id est aleatorum animos ad nequitiam se in latu mortis emergunt" is hopelessly corrupt.

against God there is no excuse nor forgiveness, and that none receives pardon. 'If any one,' says He, 'shall speak blasphemy against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him; but to him who shall have sinned against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven neither here nor in the world to come' (Matt. xii., 32; Mark iii., 28); and again the prophet says: 'If by trespass one man sinneth against another prayer shall be made for him to God; but if a man shall sin against the Lord, who shall pray for him?' (I. K. ii., 25). And the blessed Apostle Paul, the Steward and Vicar of Christ, in the exercise of his care over the Church says: 'Ye are the temple of God, and Christ dwelleth in you; if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy' (I. Cor. iii., 16). And again, the Lord in His Gospel denies sinners and reproaches them, saying: 'Depart from me all who work iniquity; I never knew you' (Matt. vii., 23). And the Apostle John says: 'Every one that sinneth is not of God, but of the devil; and ye know that the Son of God shall come to destroy the sons of the devil' (I. John iii., 8)."

A feature of the work which plays a considerable part in the controversy concerning it is the large number of citations from Scripture. Harnack reckons thirty-one of these. But if we add those which escaped his notice and count as separate references words which the author has taken from more than one chapter of the Bible, and united to form one quotation, the number is somewhat greater. Thus in the margin of the Louvain edition we count no less than thirty-nine references. These quotations are not from the Vulgate, but from the Itala, and are practically identical with the form in which the same verses appear in S. Cyprian's writings. This alone would show that the work could not date later than the fourth century; and when the treatise first engaged Professor Harnack's attention he did not venture to determine its date more closely than this. In his edition of the Shepherd of Hermas (1877) he tells us that it seems to have been written not long after the time of Cyprian—at latest perhaps in the fourth century.⁷ It is not the canonical books only of which the author avails himself. He quotes from Hermas and from the Didache. In chapter 2 he cites Herm. Tim. ix., 31, 5, introducing the passage with the words "the Divine Scriptures say (*dicit scriptura divina*)," and again in chapter 4, after quoting St. Paul's words, I. Cor. v., 11, he says: "And in another place [it is written]: 'If any brother lives after the manner of the Gentiles and is guilty of deeds like unto theirs, cease to be of his company. And unless thou do this thou shalt be a partaker in his works.'"—Herm. Mand. iv., 1, 9.⁸ This quotation is immediately

⁷ Op cit., p. 21. ⁸ These words, "*Quicumque frater more alienigarum vivit*," etc., are referred by Harnack to this passage of Hermas. There are, however, certain differences between them. Hilgenfeld denied their identity, and P. Minasi went

followed by one from the Didache: "If any brother sins in the Church and does not obey the law, let him not be reckoned amongst you till he do penance, and let him not be received into fellowship lest your prayer be defiled and hindered" (Didache xiv., 2; xv., 3). When we remember that both the author of the Muratorian fragment and Tertullian (de Pud., c. 10) deny to the Shepherd a place in the canon, and that the Didache certainly never held so high a place in the estimation of the Western Church as did the writings of Hermas, we must own that there are good *primâ facie* grounds for thinking that we have to deal with a very early document. As we have seen, the "*de Aleatoribus*" calls the Shepherd "*scriptura divina*," and quotes it and the Didache in juxtaposition to the words of S. Paul.

Nor have we yet exhausted the problems which arise from our author's citations. In chapter ii. he quotes some words which have not hitherto been traced to any book, canonical or otherwise.⁹ And yet another issue is raised by the words in chapter iii., "The Lord warns us and says, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit who is in you,' and 'Quench not the light which has shined in you.'" Professor Harnack believes that we have here two apocryphal sayings of our Lord. We are ourselves inclined to think that this is an error, and that there can be no doubt that the author is simply quoting with some freedom Ephes. iv., 30: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," and I. Thess. v., 19, "Quench not the Spirit;" but to this point we shall return later. Here then we may leave our description of the "*de Aleatoribus*;" our readers will probably be satisfied that brief though it be, it offers for solution not a few questions of more than ordinary interest.

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE WORK.

With regard to this the first of the three points which we proposed to discuss we cannot but think that the most natural conclusion to arrive at is that it is a homily, and that we possess it in the precise form in which it was originally delivered. The style of the work would appear to indicate this—the vigorous invective of certain passages (cc. vi. and ix.), and the formal peroration at the end. Moreover, the author twice addresses his audience as "*fideles*"—in chapter i., which opens with the words: "*Magna nobis ob universam fraternitatem cura est, fideles*," and in chapter v., where we find the words: "*Quid illud est, quaeso vos, fideles*;" while after having de-

so far as to endeavor to show that they are a quotation from a lost letter of St. Paul to the Corinthians (*Civiltà Cattolica*, 1892, 409-490). He is refuted by M. Callewaert in "Une lettre perdue de St. Paul et le '*de Aleatoribus*,'" Louvain, 1893. ⁹ This quotation runs as follows: "Existimate sacerdotem esse cultorem, et omnes esse apud eum [delicias], granaria plena, de quo quidquid desideraverit populus meus saturetur."

clared in chapter v. that the gaming table (*aleae tabula*) is "one of the devil's plagues and an incurable wound of sin," he opens chapter vi. with the words: "*Aleae tabula dico, ubi diabolus præst,*" a rhetorical repetition which scarcely appears possible except in a speech intended to be actually delivered.

This, however, is not Professor Harnack's view. As we have said, he holds the work to be a homiletic treatise addressed to the Bishops and faithful. He bases this opinion on the fact that in the first four chapters the duty of Bishops to exercise their disciplinary authority is developed with much care. The obligations of the episcopate are, he tells us, urged with far too much earnestness for us to suppose that this part of the work was merely intended to justify the severity with which the writer was about to speak. Besides, although after these chapters the author throughout uses the singular number, yet in this introductory passage he employs the plural, dwelling not on his own responsibilities alone, but speaking as it were in the name of the collective episcopate. The only legitimate conclusion from the passage is that the author knew that his audience comprised both Bishops and faithful, and that he desired alike to rouse a lax episcopate to the fulfilment of their duties and to move the consciences of the faithful at large in order that they might not be recalcitrant under a discipline more severe than that to which they had grown accustomed.

This argument does not appear to us in any way convincing. What could be more natural than that a Bishop who intended to rebuke a serious fault in his flock with great severity should devote a considerable part of his sermon to reminding his listeners of the solemn obligations which the episcopal office carries with it? Without such a justification it might well happen that his words would be taken amiss as imperious and unwarranted by the very men whose hearts he desired to move. More especially might he think it well thus to preface his reprimand if the delinquents were to be found, as was probably the case here, among the wealthiest members of his flock, and perhaps were for that very reason the less amenable to control. Nor can the fact that in these chapters he speaks in the plural number be urged as an argument against this view; the employment of the plural of dignity in such a passage is only what was to be expected.

It is, however, the treatment of the question of gambling that most clearly shows us that the work, whether a homily or not, was at least addressed to a local church, and was no encyclical directed to the faithful at large. The severity of its tone astonishes us. A gambler is no longer a Christian but a pagan, he is an idolater, he has committed a sin against God, for which there is no forgiveness.

Harnack assumes that these denunciations are directed against all gambling of whatever kind. Such a supposition involves us in insuperable difficulties. For though the practice is condemned by certain writers in the early Church, they never speak of it in terms such as these. Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* iii., 11, 75; *P. G.* viii., 651) severely reprehends those who spend their time in taverns, idling, dicing and insulting the passers-by. S. Ambrose describes the gambling hell in a passage of singular vehemence (*de Tobia* xi., 38); but neither of these fathers accuses the gambler of a relapse into paganism. The same is to be said of the decrees of Councils. The earliest official condemnation of the practice which we possess is contained in the acts of the Council of Elvira (canon 79), about A. D. 300. But in this, although the guilty person is excommunicated, he is to be readmitted to communion after he has shown his repentance by abstaining from the practice for a year.¹⁰ No severe disciplinary penance is imposed on him. The measures prescribed in the apostolic canons are equally mild. The 42d and 43d canons deal with gambling and prescribe that Bishops, priests and deacons, if they do not desist from the practice, are to be deposed; the inferior clergy and laity are to desist or to suffer excommunication. How are we to explain this manifest difference? The author of the "*de Aleatoribus*" brands gambling as an act of apostasy; all other authorities treat it as a mere offense against Christian morals. The explanation offered us by Professor Harnack is that the author belonged to the party who favored a more rigid ecclesiastical discipline, and further that it is evident that he must have written before St. Cornelius (251 A. D.) definitely decided that there were no sins which the Church could not forgive. Such an explanation is wholly inadequate. No party, however averse it may have been to exclude the penitent from pardon, ever took a tolerant view of idolatry or could have inflicted lenient penances on a practice which involved the burning of incense to a pagan deity. Had the customs described in the "*de Aleatoribus*" been universally prevalent, the decree of Elvira and the expressions of Clement and Ambrose would have been impossible. The only satisfactory explanation appears to be that suggested by M. Callewaert, viz., that by a custom peculiar to the city where the sermon was delivered, images of the patron of dicing were erected in the public gambling rooms, so that those who frequented them became by an almost necessary consequence guilty of the sin of idolatry.¹¹

¹⁰ The decree runs, "*Si quis fidelis aleam id est tabulam luserit nummis, plamit eum abstineri: et si emendatus cessaverit post annum poterit communionem reconciliari.*"

¹¹ This appears to be the solitary reference in the whole of Latin literature to the practice of offering sacrifice before casting the dice. Who was this inventor of dicing to whose statues worship was paid? Probably the Egyptian god Thoth whom Cicero (*de deorum nat.*, III., 22-55) identifies with the last of the five-

It is important in this connection to observe that the author's strictures are almost certainly not directed against games of chance played merely for purposes of recreation, but against that social ulcer, the gambling hell, and against certain specific acts of idolatry which took place there. All the evidence we possess goes to show that games of dice were played by the primitive Christians. The mere habit of playing apart from gambling may have been regarded as unbecoming in a cleric, but could scarcely have been looked on as a sin. Dice are not infrequently seen carved on the tombs of Christians in the Catacombs, and in some cases dice-boards have been found placed by the bodies. Lynesius (ep. 105, P. G. 66, 1484) when pleading to be excused from the responsibilities of the Bishopric of Ptolemais, mentions among the reasons which render him unfit his inveterate habit of playing dice. It is clear that he is not speaking of a sin, but simply of a habit indicative at the worst of some trivial idleness. Was the view correct which holds that the idolatry described in the "*de Aleatoribus*" was practised whenever and wherever dice were thrown we should have to attribute to the Christians of the first age of the Church a laxity totally inconsistent with the testimony of history. It is, however, far more consonant with probability that the reverence paid to the image of the inventor of dicing was restricted to the public gaming tables. Indeed, unless it be admitted that this was the case, and that further even as regards the public tables the custom was local and not general, the diversity between our author and other early Christian writers is totally inexplicable.

THE QUESTION OF PAPAL ORIGIN.

We may now turn to the question of the Papal origin of the tract. Even though it be not an encyclical, yet if it could be shown that we possess in it a homily addressed by one of the early Popes to the Church of Rome it cannot fail to be of great interest. The argument rests wholly on the passage from chapter I translated above. There are three expressions in this passage capable of being interpreted so as to indicate a Papal authorship. In the first the author tells us that God has bestowed on him the authority of the apostolate (*apostolatus ducatum*); in the second he claims to occupy the chair by which he represents the Lord (*Vicariam Domini Sedem*); in the third he uses the words "through our predecessor we have as ours

divinities bearing the name of Mercury, whom he distinguishes; this Mercury is known in the Greek mythology as the slayer of Argus. Thoth is said to have taught the Egyptians laws and letters as well as the art of dicing (Plato *Phaedrus*, 274, C.), so that the description of him as a man of great attainments in learning (*studio litterarum bene eruditus*) is justified. Some difficulties which seemed to be involved in this explanation of the passage are answered in the Louvain edition, pp. 39-41.

that source of the true apostolate on which Christ founded His Church"¹² (*originem authentici apostolatûs super quem Christus fundavit ecclesiam in superiore nostro portamus*). In weighing the value of these expressions we must remember that while doctrine remains unchanged the precise signification of some term may become more definitely fixed, so that whereas it was once employed in a looser and more general sense, it gradually is appropriated exclusively to a particular application. It is hardly necessary to refer to the term Homoiousion as example of this, which at first, susceptible of a perfectly orthodox interpretation, was eventually used only to signify a definitely heretical doctrine on the personality of our Lord. For this reason we cannot say with any certainty that either *apostolatûs ducatus* or *vicaria Domini sedes* denote a Papal origin. Although we could not use them at the present day of any but the Holy See, yet examples may be found in early Christian writings of similar terms applied to other Bishops besides those of Rome. Thus Faustus of Regii writes to the Bishop of Ruricius¹³ (ep. xi., P. L. 58, 862): "Domino beatissimo . . . atque *apostolica sede dignissimo*;" the author of the life of S. Basil attributed to S. Amphilochius says of S. Gregory Nazianzen (P. L. 73, 295): "*Throni apostolici gubernacula moderatus est*," while Sidonius Apollinaris says of S. Lupus of Troyes that he spent forty-five years "*in apostolicâ sede*" (P. L. 58, 551). These expressions are sufficiently similar to *apostolatûs ducatus* to make it impossible to build any argument on it. And the words *vicaria Domini sedes* find their equivalent in the following citations: John of Avranches in his *de Officiis Eccl.* (P. L. 147, 33) tells us that the *Pax Domini* said by the Bishop in the Mass "*ostendit eum esse vicarium Christi*;" and the monk Abbon on behalf of the Bishops of Paris and of Poitiers uses the words "*unde fratres, nos episcopi sumus vicarii Domini nostri Jesu Christi*" (P. L. 132, 766). If, then, any proof of Papal authorship is to be found, it must be looked for—as Harnack admits—in the words "*originem authentici apostolatûs super quem Christus fundavit ecclesiam in superiore nostro portamus*." This "source of the true apostolate on which Christ founded His Church" can, says Harnack, have no other possible reference than to the *Cathedra Petri*. The words themselves contain a quotation from our Lord's promise to S. Peter in Matt. xvi. We may add yet another reason for feeling confident that the professor's interpretation is correct. The homily, as we shall shortly show, contains not a few echoes from the works of S. Cyprian. The author was evidently thoroughly familiar with his writings. Now

¹² On the sense here given to the words "portare" and "in" vide Harnack "d. Aleat," pp. 90, 101, 134. ¹³ I am indebted for these and the following quotations to an article by P. Lenain in the *Revue d'histoire and de litt. religieuses*, Nov., 1900.

no one can read this expression without being reminded of the well-known term which S. Cyprian several times employs of the Petrine prerogative, *origo unitatis*. When we consider the remarkable character of the phrase *origo authenticæ apostolatûs*, and also the evident familiarity of our author with Cyprian's works, it does not seem too much to conclude that the one expression is derived from the other. Now was it possible for the Bishop of any other see but that of Rome to make this claim? There is no doubt that it was not infrequent for other Bishops to style themselves successors of Peter. Peter of Blois (ep. 113, P. L. 207, 341) says to Geoffrey, Archbishop of York: "*Quia igitur estis successor et vicarius Petri.*" S. Hilary also apostrophizes the Bishops thus: "*O dignos successores Petri and Pauli*" (fragm. ii., 78, P. L. 10, 645), and S. Gaudentius (serm. 16. P. L. 20, 958) tells his hearers that S. Ambrose will address them "*tanquam Petri apostoli successor.*" But after all, though these expressions would not now be used, yet to claim to be the vicar and successor of S. Peter (which each Bishop in his own diocese in some respect really is) is very different from claiming to possess through inheritance from Peter the source of the apostolate. That the words *superior noster* refer to the apostle himself is not, we think, really open to question.

Funk urges that but little weight is laid on *originem* in the sentence; that the really emphatic words are *authenticæ apostolatûs*, and that it is on the apostolate, not on its source, that our Lord is described as having founded His Church. He maintains that the passage should be understood simply as a claim to possess that share in the apostolate which was the common inheritance of the Bishops. To this it may be replied that in this case *originem* would have been omitted, and that its employment by S. Cyprian is quite sufficient to show that it is not a word of little moment.

It may be noted that Harnack himself has put a weapon into the hands of those who deny the Papal authorship of the tract of which they have not failed to avail themselves. We have seen that he holds that in the first four chapters the author employed the plural because he was speaking in the name of the collective episcopate. Consistently with this view he maintains that throughout the whole passage the author associates the other Bishops with himself, and makes no claim in which he is not speaking for them as much as for himself. According to this view, the chair of Peter is the prerogative not of the speaker alone, but of all Bishops equally; the Pope sets up no special claim to be regarded as his successor.¹⁴

¹⁴ To avoid the difficulty to this interpretation occasioned by the words "*in superiore nostro*," Harnack proposed to translate them as though they were in the plural, "each through his predecessor." Recently he has declared for the reading of D "*in superiore nostra*," which he translates "in our ancient Church"—i. e., the ancient Church of Rome (Texte und Unters., 1900, p. 112.)

Though he adopts this view he holds fast to the Papal authorship of the work; he urges that such language would be natural in the mouth of none but a Pope, since the employment of the promise of our Lord to S. Peter in Matt. xvi. and of the commission given to the apostle in John xxi. (which is quoted in chapter ii.) are characteristic of the Roman Church. We do not doubt that the literary instinct of the professor, which led him to feel that the language employed was distinctively Papal, is correct. But it is, of course, patent that if his analysis is accurate, and this claim was made on behalf of all the Bishops, any one of them might have urged it in the same terms and have quoted the same texts. No convincing argument can in this case be brought to prove that a Pope was the author. We have, however, shown that there are no reasons to suppose that the writer was speaking in the name of the collective episcopate, and that the plural number which he employs may well be simply the *pluralis dignitatis*. Hence it is quite unnecessary to assume that he is claiming the possession of the *origo authentici apostolatús* for any others than himself, and we venture to disbelieve that any instance will be discovered in which such an expression as "to possess through S. Peter the source of the apostolate" is applied to any other than the Pope.

DATE OF THE WORK.

The question of the date to which the work should be assigned may be considered the most important of all, since if we attribute to it a second century origin it must be held to be the oldest ecclesiastical document in the Latin language which we possess. Professor Harnack in assigning it to this period relied on three lines of argument, (1) the relation of the work to the canon of Scripture, (2) the peculiar character of the Latin in which it is composed, (3) the rigorist nature of the ecclesiastical discipline set forth in it. That his reasoning was not devoid of force may be gathered from the favor it met with from men whose competence to form a judgment is undoubted. But a formidable difficulty was almost immediately urged against attributing an early date to the work, in face of which we doubt if any arguments such as those adduced can stand. The objection in question was that to which we have already referred—the connection between the work and the writings of S. Cyprian. The most striking instance of the acquaintance of our author with the writings of the great Bishop of Carthage is found in the tenth chapter, the passage on the irremissibility of the sin of idolatry of which we have given a translation above. It will be remembered that the passage runs as follows: "For the Lord says in the Gospel that for a sin against God there is no excuse nor forgiveness and

that none receives pardon," and these words are followed by five proof texts, viz.: Matt. xii., 32; I. Kings ii., 25; I. Cor. iii., 16; Matt. vii., 23; I. John iii., 8. It is hard to believe that it is a mere coincidence that in S. Cyprian's *Testimonia* III. (a book of proof texts for the use of preachers) the 28th chapter runs thus: "That there is no remission in the Church for him who has sinned against God;" and then follow two out of the five texts quoted, Matt. xii., 32, I. Kings ii., 25. But what is more remarkable is this: the two texts which follow next in the "*de Aleatoribus*" are found in the two immediately preceding chapters of the *Testimonia*. It certainly seems to suggest to us that the preacher consulted his *Testimonia* for proof texts, that his eye caught the texts in the previous chapters and that he applied them to his purpose, though as a matter of fact they do not prove the point which he desires to establish. The threat against those who violate the temple of God (I. Cor. iii., 16) and our Lord's words: "Depart from me all ye who work iniquity" contain no proof that there is no forgiveness for sins against God. It may be observed that this remarkable parallelism had not escaped Harnack's notice, but he was of opinion that the difficulty was not of much weight because the authenticity of the third book of the *Testimonia* was not above suspicion. The genuineness of the work has, however, since then been vindicated by Dombart.¹⁵

This parallelism, striking as it is, is far from being the only one. A tabulated scheme of sixteen other passages in the "*de Aleatoribus*," with corresponding extracts from S. Cyprian, is given by Miodonski, and this list is greatly amplified by M. Callewaert in the Louvain edition. At first sight it might appear that we are endeavoring here to prove too much. It may be asked whether it is probable that a chance sermon would contain such a number of echoes from S. Cyprian's works. We reply that it is far from unlikely when we consider the great authority possessed by S. Cyprian before his fame was eclipsed by the greater name of Augustine. S. Lucifer uses no authorities but Holy Scripture and the works of Cyprian. S. Jerome (ep. 107, 12) to the advice to "be constant in the reading of Scripture adds the words, "*Cypriani opuscula semper in manu teneat*," and Prudentius (Hymn 13, *Passio Cypriani* l. 8) says: "*Te leget omnis amans Christum, tua, Cypriane, discib.*" In a paper like the present it is, of course, impossible to reproduce the researches of the two authors we have mentioned. We can only refer the reader to their works. We may, however, be permitted to quote two of the cases in point so as to afford some indication of the character of the more striking of the resemblances found. In "*de*

¹⁵ Hilgenfeld's "*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*," xxii., 385. Vide Harnack "*de Aleat.*," p. 2.

Aleat.," c. 3, we find "episcopo negligente et nulla de scripturis sanctis documenta promente." S. Cyprian *ad Dem.* 3 has these words: "Nobis tacentibus et nulla de scripturis sanctis praedicationibusque divinis documenta promentibus." In "*de Aleat.*," c. v., we have: "Quam magna et larga pietas Domini fidelium quod in futurum praescius nobis consulat nequis frater incautus denus laqueis diaboli capiatur." In Cyprian *de Mortalitate* 19 we meet with: "Quod Dominus praescius futurorum suis consulat," and in *de Unitate* 2, "ne denus incauti in mortis laqueum revolvamur."

If it, then, be really the case that our author is under considerable obligations to S. Cyprian we cannot assign an earlier date to the work than 250 A. D. Let us, however, consider the arguments brought forward on the other side by Professor Harnack; for, as we have already said, he pleaded his case so well as to convince not a few that we really possessed an original treatise of S. Victor.

We will notice first the argument from the language employed; for after what we have already said, this may be dealt with very briefly. It is urged that we possess some of the writings both of S. Cornelius (251 A. D.) and of Novatian, the antipope who opposed him; that both of these wrote in the Latin of the cultivated classes, and that it is highly improbable that after their day a Pope would be elected who wrote in the dialect of the common people. We may admit this—though the force of such reasoning is always somewhat uncertain—and yet say that an argument which would be good when applied to the case of a formal treatise has no weight in regard to a sermon. Even if a Pope could write in good Latin, it by no means follows that he would not preach in the language of his auditors. There is no indication that this sermon was ever what we may term revised for publication; it was very probably delivered exactly as it stands at present.

The argument to which the professor himself attached most weight was, however, that drawn from the position adopted by the author towards the canon of Holy Scripture. He points out to us that in the work we have no less than twenty-seven texts introduced with various formulas of quotation, yet that in all these there is no indication that the author recognized the division of the sacred books into the Old and New Testaments. In place of this division we can detect by the aid of the formulas mentioned a tripartite classification. Citations from the Gospel are introduced with the words "*Dominus dicit in evangelis*;" the second formula is "*dicit scriptura divina*" or "*dicit scriptura*" or "*dicit Dominus*," and these words preface the quotations from the Old Testament, the Apocalypse, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Didache; while the quotations from the epistles of S. Paul and S. John are cited with the words "*dicit apostolus*." He

further notes that while the quotations from the Gospels and the Old Testament are accurate, those from the epistles are given with utmost freedom, and from this, when taken in connection with the fact that they form a distinct class, he draws the conclusion that at the early date at which the author wrote the epistles had not yet come to be regarded as of equal authority with the remainder of the canon.

It need not be pointed out how momentous such a discovery would be in regard to the history of the canon, even if we prescind from the theory about the position which Harnack supposes S. Paul's epistles to have held. It will probably strike every one that the author's greater accuracy in quoting the Gospels is easily explained if, as is far from unlikely, he was more familiar with them than with the epistles. Yet if it be true that previous to the separation of the canon into the Old and New Testaments the early Church possessed a tripartite division such as that indicated by the professor, to have detected this will have been indeed an epoch-making discovery. The value of the professor's conclusion can only be estimated by a somewhat close scrutiny of the evidence.

Now with regard in the first place to the quotations from the Gospels, there are but four of them in all, and of these four one (c. 2) lacks the required formula and is simply introduced with the words "*cum dicat.*" Though one exception may seem a trifle, yet when the whole induction is based on four instances it is not devoid of importance.

There are eight quotations from the epistles, and here again we are confronted by an awkward exception. This exception is contained in the words we have cited above: "The Lord warns us and says, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit who is in you,' and 'Quench not the light which has shined in you.'" In view of the admitted freedom with which our author quotes the epistles we do not doubt that these words are simply Eph. iv., 20 and I. Thess. v., 19 freely cited; and this seems to be the opinion of all the commentators except Harnack. He regards them as two apocryphal Logia, which the author is attributing to our Lord. We own that we are tempted to think that he would not have been so unwilling to trace their origin to S. Paul had it not been for the fact that to assign such an authorship to them would have been destructive of his theory. There would then have been a quotation from the epistles introduced not with the formula "*apostolus dicit*" to indicate that it could only claim the inferior authority of apostolic origin, but with the words "*monet Dominus et dicit,*" which clearly denote that to the speaker it possessed the full character of the inspired Word of God.

But it is the third class which presents the greatest difficulties to the theory. It contains fifteen quotations, but of these six are of no

value to the professor, for they merely follow other quotations and are introduced with "*et iterum*" or "*et alio loco*." The nine which remain are divided among no less than five different formulas. We have "*dicit Dominus*" four times, "*dicit Scriptura*" twice and "*propheta dicit*," "*dicit Scriptura divina*" and "*in doctrinis apostolorum*" once each. Surely there is but little ground here for saying that the formulas employed are sufficient evidence to prove the existence of a special division of the canon. Nor indeed can it be said that the quotations from the Old Testament are uniformly more accurate than those from S. Paul. Some of them are correctly cited, others not so, while two which are apparently drawn from the Old Testament defy all attempts at identification.

Is it not far more natural to suppose that the author quoted without any special desire to indicate the part of Scripture he was using, and that though he usually cited the words of the four Gospels with the formula "*dicit Dominus in evangelio*," and those of the apostles with "*dicit apostolus*," yet he was not greatly concerned to hold fast to this manner of speaking, and did in fact sometimes deviate from it? If this be admitted, and it seems a reasonable explanation, we have not a shred of evidence for the alleged tripartite classification. Moreover, if further proof be required that Harnack was too hasty in drawing his conclusions, it may be found in the fact that the formulas in question are precisely those usually employed by S. Cyprian in quoting from Scripture. There is no doubt that he at least was cognizant of the division of the canon into the Old and New Testaments, for Tertullian habitually uses it; yet he scarcely ever thus distinguishes the sacred books. Our author's mode of quoting does in fact but provide us with a new proof that Cyprian was the master whom he followed.

The employment of passages from *Hermas* and from the *Didache* among the Scriptural quotations need not afford us much difficulty, though Harnack attributes considerable importance to it. Here, again, even if we concede that texts from these works might not have been employed in a formal homiletic treatise at so late a date as that to which we assign the work, there is nothing to surprise us in their occurrence in a sermon. It is true that Tertullian speaks scornfully of *Hermas* in the *de Pudicitia*, but it must be remembered that this was written after his lapse into Montanism; previous to his fall he had used it as a work which, if not canonical, was possessed of high authority. These books were part of the recognized religious literature of the period, and nothing could be more natural than that a preacher who recalled a text from them suitable to the purpose in hand should employ it without hesitation.

It only remains for us to answer the argument derived from the

alleged rigorist teaching of chapter x. It is, we are told, quite impossible that any Pope living after S. Cyprian could have taught publicly that there were sins for which there is no forgiveness. It was the Pope who in the question of the *lapsi* had taken the lead in insisting on the great truth that the Church has power to grant absolution for the most heinous crimes. It was due to the defense of this doctrine by the Pope that the Church of Rome was torn by the Novatian schism; nor had any voice spoken more clearly in their support than that of S. Cyprian himself. Who, then, can imagine that after this a Pope would teach the exact contrary, and, further, would assert that gambling—a much less grave sin than that of the *lapsi*—was one of the sins for which there is no remission? We reply that in the first place we have shown that the crime denounced by our author was not mere gambling, but the idolatry which he regarded as necessarily connected with gambling, and therefore the most grievous of all sins; and secondly that the words in question are susceptible of a perfectly orthodox interpretation, namely, that after wilful and persistent apostasy to obtain the grace of a true repentance is so difficult as to be morally almost impossible. That he does not teach that any single lapse into idolatry is a sin for which there is no forgiveness is evident from his exhortation to the gamblers in the following chapter to repent. He bids them in lieu of staking their money at the gambling table place it on the table of the Lord; which they could not have done were they to remain till death cut them off from the Church's communion. Such, too, and no other must have been the sense in which S. Cyprian desired Testimonia iii., 28, to be understood, unless we believe that in that passage he contradicted all his other utterances on the subject. It is only in virtue of a misunderstanding that our author can be credited with inculcating a rigorist doctrine, and that on this ground a very early date can be postulated for the work.

We may therefore safely conclude that we must not date the homily earlier than 250 A. D. It may have been composed by any of the Popes between that date and the middle of the next century. It seems impossible to arrive at a more precise result than this; for though certain peculiarities distinctive of the Latin of North Africa led Professor Landay to suggest that the author was S. Melchiades (311-314), who was "natione Afer," the use of these forms may well be due to the influence exerted on the author by his master Cyprian.

It is doubtless to be regretted that the results of our inquiry are to some extent negative, and that we must leave the name of the Pope who wrote the work an open question. Yet the study of the "*de Aleatoribus*" may be of value in more than one way. It is hard to read Professor Harnack's comment, enriched as it is with the wealth

of learning which he is able to bring to bear on the subject, without being at least for the moment persuaded that he is right. As we have seen, many Catholic scholars accepted his results as assured, and rejoiced over the discovery of so early an encyclical. It required the patient investigation of scholars specially qualified for the work to estimate the true value of his conclusions; but when that investigation had taken place the results so eagerly accepted proved to be as unsubstantial as the baseless fabric of a dream. Has not this its application with regard to much of that higher criticism of the Scriptures which is in vogue at the present day? Theories of the construction and the date of the sacred books are put forward by men possessed of great erudition and gifted with all the endowments requisite to state their case with lucidity and power. It is no wonder that their arguments seem to the reader overwhelming. Still it is well to learn from the history of this discussion that a really brilliant piece of reasoning based on internal evidence may, when weighed in the balances, be found wanting. We shall do well not to accept such theories too readily, but wait in patience till they have been tested by that rigorous scrutiny which they must in due time undergo.

In itself, too, the work is full of interest and will well repay any one who cares to peruse the few pages of which it consists. It is a veritable voice from the first ages of the Church which here speaks to us. It is not a treatise addressed to a circle of educated readers, nor even a homily revised for publication; but a sermon couched in the homely rough language in which it was preached. In it we can still hear the faithful shepherd of his flock reproving, entreating and rebuking. And he is speaking to his hearers with that note of authority which has been the characteristic of the Catholic Church in all ages—that authority which her enemies cannot understand, and which the sects who have left her dare not imitate. He was probably a man of no social position, nor was he, as far as we can judge, a highly educated man. Yet he bids his flock listen to his warnings and obey them at their souls' peril, for he is the successor of the apostles and speaks as the representative of Christ.

G. H. JOYCE, S. J.

St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, North Wales.

THE GREEK TEMPLES IN SICILY.

PROBABLY most visitors to Sicily enter the island at Palermo, to which a daily service of steamers runs from Naples. On arrival there the luxury of comfort, perfection of climate, beauty of scenery and the riches of Saracenic and Norman art all combine to beguile the traveler, so that he lends a willing ear to the Siren-song to "quit all hope of further progress" and makes his sojourn there absorb most of the time at his disposal. Yet all true travel should be the means of furnishing the mind with an aftermath of instruction, and if this motive arouses the will to activity, there are few spots upon this earth within so narrow a limit that are so full of remuneration to intelligent enterprise as Sicily affords us. No well-read man can go there and not find his mind excited by a keen interest at the historic scenes this small island will recall to his memory, scenes that will take him back to the days of Troy, the voyages of Ulysses, of the mythology of those times, and which carry the memory on in continuous current through the palmy days of Greece and Rome, Carthage and Byzantium, until the stream becomes mingled with Arab and Norman, French, Spanish and modern Italian. Even the great headland at Palermo, now known as the Mount of Pilgrims, has upon its summit the traces of the camp of Hamilcar Barca (Barak), and this will set in motion a train of enquiry which will follow you all round the island, and produce reminiscences of school reading which still need solution and elucidation. Who were the men this general commanded, this race who have left their memorial on every shore from Syria's strand to Cornwall, from Sicily, Spain and Southern France to Rhodesia in South Africa? We have called them Phœnicians as the Roman did Pœni, and the Greeks Phoinikes from the palm trees that marked their settlements; others named them Sidonians, Tyrians or Cathaginians from their towns, while to the Israelites they were Canaanites or "dwellers in the lowlands." But who they were or whence they came as a race is still an unsolved riddle. They were the first of all early commercial peoples, we believe, and Homer's epithet for them is that of a race "skilled in trickery." Here to this lovely Sicilian land they came bringing with them their Eastern instruments of music and fabrics of matchless purple, and here on every "high place" they reared their temples to cruel and insatiable Ashtaroth, or Astarte and kindled their fires to the blood-stained Moloch.

It is not, however, the signs of Phœnician or Cathaginian occupation that we now propose to trace, although this might be made

the subject of singularly interesting investigation and serious reflection for modern peoples who seem to be setting up commerce as their national deity; we are about to visit the remains left by a succeeding race of higher ideals and nobler aspirations, and one to which the human race will ever owe the debt of its gratitude. From Palermo we can now go by the railway to the Greek temples at Segesta, Selinunte and Girgenti, so that the difficulty of access no longer remains, and although especial provision has to be made for a visit to the two first mentioned, yet at the last we shall find a hotel as delightful as the Hotel des Palmes at Palermo itself.

Most of us have never seen a Greek temple save in pictures, and desire to look upon the reality even though it be battered by the buffets of time, for that is a far less cruel fate than falling into the hands of the adapter or modern type of "restorer." Let us then start first for Segesta, to within five miles' ride of which the train will take us, landing us in a part of the country reputed to have been the settlement of the very descendants of the fugitives from Troy itself. What one barfers for the five hours in the train (although the distance be but little over fifty miles!) is the acquaintance with the old roadways over wild mountains with gorgeous scenery and exhilarating air; yet these are not entirely wanting even to the ease-loving traveler of to-day. You round the base of Mount Pellegrino, where within a cave so lately as 1664 were discovered the remains of Sta. Rosalia, niece of the Norman William the Good—

That grot where olives nod,
Where, darling of each heart and eye,
From all the youths of Sicily
St. Rosalie retired to God.

Marmion i., 23.

Then skirting the beautiful Bay of Castellamare for half its circuit the line strides inland and you alight beneath the precipitous front of Calatafimi. The name is better known now for the victory which Garibaldi here gained in 1860 over the Bourbon troops, but to us it is the boundary of those venerable travelers whose wanderings we revel in during school days as told by Virgil in his entrancing song. Here, taking mule or carriage, you thread a valley through which runs the stream Scamander—so named by the colonists in memory of that of their native land. Egesta, later Segesta, was one of their most important cities; now it is nearly as barren a waste as Troy itself. Once it had a teeming population and great riches, for this very stream ran ensanguined with the blood of 10,000 of its inhabitants, slain by Agathocles of Syracuse to obtain their treasures.

As we advance soon the great temple comes in sight upon our left, and it is a picture never likely to be forgotten. In appearance

it is unquestionably the grandest for general effect of all the temples that remain *erect* in Sicily. It stands at the end of a long, broad valley, upon the natural pedestal of an isolated mountain spur, on the brink of a profound precipice, a site chosen with that wisdom of artistic perception which never failed the Grecian architect. Wild and lonesome heights surround it on every side, bare in the extreme. In a wilderness of wandering mountains and savage cliffs, where all is depth and height, the temple of Segesta rises yellow, majestic and solitary. Its awful desolateness strikes awe and even terror into the mind of the beholder. The silence adds to the impressiveness of the picture; the absence of all signs of human life, the stillness, the sky unflecked with cloud, the sun with its powerful light and heat all seem to urge the valley into slumber. There comes upon one the sense of an oppressing, overpowering Necessity or Fate against which all effort of resistance is futile; the immensity of Time in which the span of human life is so minute a fraction, the boundlessness of Space in which this world is such an atom—all these seem forced upon the mind's emotions.

On ascending one hill you see in the distance Eryx, standing like a sentinel of the Western coast, where was the shrine of Astarte, Aphrodite, Venus—which you will; the sea glitters in the sun at another point, while the eye ranges with glorious sweeps of vision over a saddened, melancholy, weird and fearful panorama. Nought is to be heard save the breeze as it sighs among ruins or rustles the thistles and wild fennel at our feet; the butterfly aimlessly drifts hither and thither and comes across the eye like a silent monitor of the shortness of man's day and the infirmity of his purpose, or like some soul of the dead, as the peasantry believe, to revisit its old home. Birds of prey hover in the serene and silent sunlight like omens of approaching evil, and one treads the ground as if it were a cemetery paved with the tombs of the dead, so solemn and oppressive is the spot. You stand on one hill of ruins, amongst which a theatre has been excavated from the rocky sides, and in which only tragedies would now seem suitable to be enacted, and you gaze across a ravine to another hill where the temple crowns a precipitous crest, while again you see beyond still another height also strewn with the stones of edifices. Amid so much desolation we turn gratefully to a testimony of that eternal truth that never dies, a witness to man's best nature in his strivings after God, and a sign that earnest effort is never wholly lost.

The Doric temple that is the object of our visit is one of the best preserved in Sicily, for its stone is less corroded than in the others. Its thirty-six huge columns—six in front and back and fourteen on either side—have never been finished and are still unfluted, and

hence there is a heavy appearance about them. At their base they are nearly seven feet in diameter, and the height of the column nearly five times this diameter. It is raised upon a stylobate or platform of four high steps, but these are unhewn, and the cella or sanctuary was not even begun, so that this temple can never have been used for worship. It is 192 feet long by 77 or 78 feet wide, or inclusive of the steps, 200 feet by 85 feet. The entablature is nearly entire all round, and the present government has taken praiseworthy care to maintain by iron rods the architrave, whose enormous blocks span from column to column. It must have been begun before B. C. 409, but the continual quarrelling with the Greek town of Selinus, or Selinunte, over fifty miles south of this, to assist the inhabitants against which was the cause of the Carthaginian, and four years previously (B. C. 413) of the Athenian, invasion, must have impeded its progress. The city, however, continued to exist long after its antagonist was destroyed, and we have a vivid picture in Cicero of how a Roman prætor was able to misuse his power, to which an event here furnished an illustration. The people of Segesta possessed a statue of Artemis, or Diana, in brass, "not only invested with most sacred character," he says, "but also wrought with the most exquisite skill and beauty, so that it seemed even to enemies worthy of being religiously worshiped" (*in Verrem*, xxxiii). It had been carried off by the Carthaginians, but was brought back and restored to the city by Publius Scipio Africanus on the taking of Carthage. It was replaced in Segesta amid the joy and delight of the citizens and was "worshiped by them, visited by all strangers, and when I (Cicero) was quæstor it was the very first thing they shewed me." But Verres, "that enemy of all sacred things, the violator of all religious scruples, saw it" and ordered the magistrates to pull it down and give it to him. They did all in their power to resist, but entreaties and opposition were futile. He oppressed the city to such a degree that eventually, subdued by ill-treatment and fear, they had to save themselves by letting their treasure go. Even then no Segestan could be found to do the evil work of the prætor and dislodge the statue from its pedestal, and barbarians had to be brought from Lilybæum (the modern Marsala) before it was removed.

Egesta was an unfortunate town, and if we translate its name by the Latin for poverty we may still find an appropriateness in the title, for nothing can exceed the misery of its few present inhabitants or the squalor and brutality of the life that prevails. The old inhabitants found the name so full of ill-luck that they changed the name to Segesta during the first Punic war, but the blessing of the corn field was not for them, and it remains to this day profoundly impressive in its history and its desolation.

We can continue our journey by rail from this temple to within eight miles of the next celebrated spot, viz., Selinunte, for which Castelveltrano is the nearest station, and here we shall find ourselves upon the western limits of the power of the ancient Greeks. This, their frontier town, is not only memorable for possessing the relics of the grandest temples in Europe, but for its siege by the Carthaginians in B. C. 409, when the stubborn bravery of its people held out against Hannibal Giscon and his 100,000 men for ten days. The descendants of the Tyrian at Carthage were summoned by the descendants of Troy at Segesta to give them help against Selinunte; landing at Lilybæum, the present Marsala, about thirty-five miles away, they marched straight on Selinus. Help was sent to the beleaguered town from Syracuse, but arrived too late, and of its 24,000 inhabitants only a tenth are said to have escaped to Girgenti. And here let us note that it was the "eternal Eastern question" that is the keynote of the history of ancient Sicily, as it is so frequently still that of Europe. It was Greece fighting against the Phœnician, Roman against Carthaginian, Norman against Saracen. As Freeman says, Sicily was the "breakwater" between the Eastern and Western divisions of the Mediterranean, and surely we owe a debt of gratitude to the brave little island for withstanding each attempt to wrest it from Europe. Her 500 years of Greek rule may be regarded as a single-handed combat with Orientalism, and even though at a later date Sicily became for 200 years a province of Africa, yet at the bidding of the Norman she again shook herself free and set herself in the forefront of the battle between Christendom and Islam. It was here at Selinunte that Africa began its most serious attacks upon Europe, and it was here in this "Village of Idols," as they termed it, that in later times the Moslem made his longest stand against King Roger. Christian hermits taking abode here after the Arab expulsion have left behind them their signs upon its stones to testify to the triumph of the Cross against the faith of Mahomet.

Although the remains at Selinus are simply tremendous and present the most remarkable mass of ruins in Europe, yet they do not render the pleasure we should anticipate, since there is not a perfect column erect, and the mind has to reconstruct out of these gigantic heaps the glorious structures that Grecian art spread upon these hills. On one eminence are three important temples and on another three large ones and one small,* the last a temple *in antis*, i. e., consisting only of a cella with columns in front. Between the two hills is a valley through which a small stream makes its way to the sea, and whose sides are strewn with the stones of the city. The mouth

* They measure, including steps, 139 feet by 60 feet, 230 feet by 88 feet, 192 feet by 80 feet, 28½ feet by 15 feet.

of the stream now choked up with sand and water plants was once the harbor still called the Marinella di Selinunte, but this once well drained valley, the work, it is said, of the wise Empedocles of Girgenti, is now a swamp, and the monument to his memory erected by grateful citizens has its fragments removed to the Museum of Palermo.

Selinus stood on two plateaus formed by the spurs of the mountains as they descend to the coast, and between them is the valley or Gorgo di Cotone, of which we have spoken. The more western of these spurs was occupied by the Acropolis with the town at its rear, the whole enclosed by walls, while the eastern plateau was a sacred precinct without any secular buildings attached. At first sight the mass of ruins seems so chaotic that it appears hopeless to describe them. Sixty mighty columns lie on the earth like regiments of overturned ninepins. In their stupendous ruin and desolation they are appalling, and from their colossal size deserve their local title of *I pillieri dei giganti*. The largest of the temples on the Acropolis hill, supposed to have been dedicated to Hercules, had seventeen columns on either side and a double row in front; those on its northern side have fallen outward and lie in regular order, the drums of the shafts disjoined, but section above section, and beyond these come the huge blocks of architrave, frieze and cornice, as if awaiting the mason to fit them together. Those on the southern side have fallen inwards and crushed the cella in their descent, a grievous scene of destruction. Some of the pillars were monoliths, but usually they are composed of six separate blocks. They vary in diameter, but were 28 feet in height. They have not the usual number of flutes (*viz.*, twenty), those in the portico having 16 and the others 18. Another diversity in this temple to most others is the great narrowness of the cella or sanctuary compared to its length, for while the length of this temple, inclusive of the steps, is 230 feet and breadth 88 feet, the cella is 131 feet by 30 feet. This once magnificent structure stood upon a stylobate or platform of four steps, but was approached in front by an additional nine. It is the oldest of the shrines raised by the Selinuntans and is thought to have been erected soon after their settlement here in B. C. 628. In the interesting Museum at Palermo are preserved portions of its entablature and three of its metopes which must have been executed at the same time. Copies of them are in the British Museum, for they are precious as illustrating the earliest period of Doric sculpture in the island. They are without beauty, but although stiff and grotesque they contain evidence of the earnest effort to portray vigorous life; they are not conventional, for it is a struggle in the fetters of archaic tradition; there is a freedom and hopefulness in them that makes

them highly interesting and important to the student of art, for notwithstanding their uncouthness they are the work of early genius and unique. Their exaggeration of limb and feature is startling when seen in a museum. As Gothic carvings made to stand high above the beholder, when viewed near by are appallingly hideous and distorted, yet from beneath appear graceful and suitable, so these no doubt produced a more effective and chastened aspect when in their lofty position in the frieze. The subjects are, as is usual, derived from ancient myths. One is a conqueror in his four-horsed chariot in almost complete relief, with female figures of Victory holding above his head the laurel crown; another Perseus beheading Medusa, with the Goddess Athena in the background, and the third Heracles and the Cecropes.

Twenty-five yards north of this temple is another which had thirteen fluted columns on each side and six in front, thirty-four in all, whose capitals have enormous projections. The columns taper more than those of the earlier temple near by, and their height is rather more than five times their diameter. Its peristyle or surrounding court of pillars is unwontedly spacious, since the cella here, too, is extremely narrow. It is approached by five steps in front and stands upon a platform of four. Its dedication is unknown. There is the small temple *in antis*, as it is termed, to the south of the most ancient one of Heracles, and beyond this, above the waters of the African sea that beat against the rock a hundred feet below, is another large one that stood upon a stylobate of four steps and had thirty-six columns of twenty flutes each, but not one of which is now entire.

The eastern hill, nearly a mile away, was made a sacred enclosure in the sixth century B. C. The stupendous remains of its three temples are all together, facing east and west, the most northern thought to have been dedicated to Apollo, the most southern to Hera, but the deity of the intervening one is unknown, and of its columns only a few sections remain. The temple of Hera had an approach of eleven steps and stylobate of four; it measures with steps 228 feet by 91 feet and had fifteen columns on either side, six in front, and of these portions of three alone stand erect. Dis-jointed they lie like those of Heracles on the opposite hill, ranged on the ground, appealing to the generosity of the learned societies of Europe to restore them and thus do honor to our new century. The porticoes have fallen outwards. Metopes from this temple are also at Palermo and mark a period when the art of sculpture was at its highest development and perfection. Their subjects are Athena slaying the giant Enceladus, whom Zeus placed beneath Ætna; Heracles slaying the Amazon Hippolyta; Zeus and Hera on Mount

Ida; Artemis and Actæon. The skill evinced in their composition and execution is not so great as that which characterized the best Attic art, but is still of a very high order. The female figures have the exposed part of the body inlaid with white marble, but there is a lack of the freedom of action and drapery that we have learnt from the schools of Greece. Yet the progress from the work of the Metopes of Heracles to those of Hera is astonishing.

The northernmost of these three temples is one of the largest Grecian temples known. Like those of Eggesta it was left unfinished. Its huge columns are unfluted, and it would seem not to have had the full number intended, as others were being quarried when the work was arrested. It differs from other temples here in being octastyle peripteral instead of the usual hexastyle, *i. e.*, it had eight columns in front and rear and a row on either side, making forty-six altogether. It was probably dedicated to Apollo, as an inscription found in it indicates. Measuring 371 feet by 177 feet, it exceeds in length all others in the island, but is surpassed in area by one at Girgenti. The height of its columns was $53\frac{1}{2}$ feet and their diameters taper from $11\frac{1}{4}$ feet to $6\frac{1}{4}$ or 8 feet. Shaken down by some convulsion of nature that destroyed so many of these marvelous buildings, the heaped up columns and entablature form a "most stupendous and sublime mound of ruins," and one sighs for some effort to be made to replace its stones.

A visit to the quarries whence the material for these temples was taken will be made by all who are capable of feeling the peculiar help that it gives the imagination to be actually in touch with the vanished workman. Like the pleasure afforded the beholder by seeing the very marks of the Egyptian draughtsman for his design on the walls of some of the tombs of the Kings at Thebes, or by the sight of the more recently opened houses in Pompeii, where the authorities have wisely left everything in its original place and not removed it to a museum, so in these quarries we may easily perceive the actual method of work and picture the laborer at his toil. Indeed it needs in this case little effort to annihilate centuries and to think that the workmen have gone to their meal and will presently return, instead of the truth that they have for over 2,000 years been wrapped in their long siesta. They were evidently hewing and shaping these mighty drums for the pillars of Apollo's temple out of this limestone rock when the cry arose that the Carthaginian was upon them and his hosts approaching along the Lilybæum road. They had to leave incontinently and fly across the moorland towards the fortified Acropolis five miles away. Some had been transporting those finished sections of the columns that now lie at the foot of the quarry, and you may trace others along the road to Selinus and almost see the patient oxen slowly dragging the heavy wooden trolley upon

which one was placed. The news comes that the enemy is at hand on this Campobello road where we are, the men hastily unyoke the creamy white buffaloes and drive them before them, but others only seek safety for themselves and leave their teams, which remain dreamily standing in the sun flicking their heavy tails across their flanks, indifferent to the human catastrophe that is being enacted around them. The invaders come up and under new masters there is no cessation, but only an alteration of toil for the captured beasts, and they are employed for the purposes of the transport of the army. There probably on the roadway the cart and its load stood and rotted, and there you may see the stones of Apollo which have lain from that day until this.

Selinus is spoken of by Virgil as "*palmosa Selinus*," and it is hard to realize this amid the bareness and desolateness of the present city, but a dwarf fan-palm is very abundant, the only species native to Europe, and perhaps this is what he refers to. The city is said to have taken its name from the plant (*selinos*) sacred to Heracles, to whom the first temple was reared. It is commonly spoken of as parsley, but it was not our culinary vegetable, and it is doubtful what was meant. We know that it was some fragrant herb used in festival garlands, at funeral rites or as the wreath of victory in the games of the Corinthian isthmus, and some have thought that it might be the wild celery that grows freely here, but this is too interesting a subject to deal with.

To see the next group of Sicilian temples we must go eastwards to Girgenti, about sixty-eight miles off, and we may avoid returning to Palermo to obtain the direct line of railway thither if we will drive along the new road that will take us there in nineteen hours. A railway is projected, but if we drive we can break our journey at Sciacca la degna (24 miles), and the road which passes through vineyards and cornfields and along the sands of the Libyan Sea is useful in affording an insight into outlying districts of the island. We shall leave to the left the quarries at Menfrici from whose rock the metopes of the temples at Selinus seem to have come. From the highlands we shall catch a view of the island of Pantellaria, between which and the mainland arose on 18th of July, 1831, a volcanic island of four or five miles' circumference, only to disappear as mysteriously on the 18th of January of the next year. Now the coral fishers are busy near its site. Spots will recall to our mind every varying race and visitor that has been connected with this fair land from the mythic Daedalus to Norman Roger, until we reach the modern Porto Empedocle within four miles by a rail of the towering heights of Girgenti, the Greek Acragas and Roman Agrigantum.

No Sicilian city is more nobly situated than this—the towns of Castro-giovanni, or Enna, and Taormina alone compete with it. Whether approached by sea or land it is equally grand and striking. The lofty chain of rock rising precipitously from the northern lowlands, but descending in terraces and rolling slopes like mighty waves to the south, is composed of cockle, scallop, oyster, whelk and other shell and marine deposit, and seems like a huge wall raised by Neptune or some god of the ocean to guard from the sea some spot where his nymphs might play and his Nereids slumber. In billow upon billow of gray and purple hill it mounts up until the long steep ridge of its citadel stands forth over 1,200 feet in height against a background of serene and violet sky. Imagination can scarcely form an exaggerated picture of what a glorious vision it must have presented when with its Acropolis intact at one end of the ridge and the mighty temple of the Parthenon upon its Rupe Atenea at the other and adorned with long lines of the finest monuments of Grecian art upon its terraced front it looked down upon the southern sea. It is singularly unlike other Greek colonies in Sicily in being withdrawn from the water, but the seaboard, with its harbors and fleets, never had any attraction for the company of Dorian settlers that came here. They were a pastoral and agricultural people, worshippers of Demeter rather than Poseidon. They were also lovers of horses, and this interest they probably first brought to Sicily, if the chariot-loving Phœnician had not done so previously, and it continues still a trait in the island's character. Many a Sicilian steed won the Olympic and Pythian crown for the lords of Acragos and Syracuse. Diodorus records with enthusiasm the numerous chariots of the people of this city and the world renowned breed of steeds that carried everything before them in the games of ancient Hellas. We have, moreover, the name at least of one, viz., Phrenicos, that won the prize in the seventy-third Olympian games for Hiero of Syracuse in the entries for single racers. Thus the popular taste was much more directed to their inland plains than to the sea, which they sadly neglected. Not that there was any natural harbor on their coast, but people who could raise such temples as they did could easily have made a haven if they had wished to do so. The degenerate modern inhabitant is actually doing this and using for it some of the precious stones of which the ancient Greek was the hewer. May Neptune and all the gods avenge themselves on such sacrilege!

The preference for the horse, I have said, is still a marked characteristic of the island. The Arab domination for 200 years, no doubt, has helped to continue it from earlier date, but just as in Italy and southern lands you most frequently meet with oxen, mules, asses

and donkeys as the beasts of burthen, so here you find the horse. Camels were once common as they were in Gaul and exist occasionally still in parts of Spain and in the neighborhood of Pisa, but they have now disappeared in Sicily. The Agrigentines ought to have taken the horse as their badge, but they perversely chose a crab, not that they appreciated salt water, but because that creature's form of dwelling seemed to typify their own ridged home on the seashore. Later they chose an eagle when their pride soared high after their victory at Himera, and finally they have adopted a Telamon or Gigante from a rebus upon their modern name of Girgenti.

Acragas and Syracuse were by far the most prosperous of all the Greek colonies in Sicily, and far outstripped the others in magnificence and wealth. Acragas was ten miles round, and divided into five townships, of which the present city occupies but one, and that the oldest. In the number of its ancient divisions and in its present shrinkage to one, and this the first chosen, it resembles its great compeer, modern Syracuse. The goats now feed upon the Rock of Athena; oliveyards and orchards of fig, lemon and orange cover the ancient quarters known by the names of Agrigentum, Agrigentum in Camico and Neapolis; rolling fields and garden enclosures have erased the once busy Agora and its paved and pillared ways, and the earthy deposit of the centuries now covers the dwellings of its nobles.

In shape it was quadrangular, the side tilted up to the top of the high chain of rock we have spoken of and then coming down towards the seashore. The approach therefore from the south displays the whole city before us. The temples all seem to have clustered on this side, and if the position of those still erect be singularly striking and grand, how far surpassing these must have been the grandeur of the Parthenon that once stood, not on this lower terrace of rocky barrier forming the city's wall, but upon the lofty crest of the Rupe Atenea rising 1,240 feet in air. Alas! all that remains of this temple is the stepped platform or stylobate upon which the wise builders of those times always placed their work, as we give a pedestal to any object of especial artistic value. It is not quite certain whether it was dedicated to the goddess whose name it now bears and whose sacred trees surround her throne, but it is most probable. Far out to sea would the mariner have been able to see the shrine of the deity that had a dwelling so high. Simple and unadorned though its architecture would be, it would be imposing, majestic and inspiring. Greek genius displayed itself in selecting such elevated spots as this whereon to fix the witness of his worship, the tribute of his piety and the embodiment of his skill. By

their beauty and dignity he raised in the mind a sense of awe and reverence and in the heart of the departing child of Hellas a yearning for the protection of his gods and a love of his native land.

As we approach from the seaside we pass a few remains of the Temple of Æsculapius that once contained the famous statue of Apollo, "on whose thigh there was the name of Myron inscribed in diminutive silver letters" (*Cic. in Verr. xliii.*), and which was stolen finally by Verres the prætor. Then just without the walls is the later tomb of the wise ruler Theron, and we enter the city by a sunk road at the Porta Aurea, by which Carthaginian and Roman have passed. We have immediately upon our left the temple of Zeus, and on the right we stand beneath the posticum of that of Heracles. The king of the gods and the king of heroes were thus placed as warders of this, the main entrance to the city, and remiss those porters must have been or sadly lukewarm their suppliants to have permitted so many enemies to gain access to ancient Acragas. We turn at once to the left and we are amid the huge remains of the temple of Zeus, begun about 480 B. C. and finished all but the roof, if that were intended to be finished, in 406 B. C., when Carthage took the town. It was not only the largest temple raised by Acragantines or other Sicilian colonists, but the largest ever attempted by the Greek architect anywhere, and worthily dedicated to the king of the gods himself. It may be that the Ionic temple of Diana at Ephesus exceeded this in size, but it is difficult to ascertain the dimensions of that temple so entire was its destruction, but some authorities give its length as 388 feet by 187 feet, while this of Zeus is 363 feet by 182 feet. This that we are now considering was a heptastyle, *i. e.*, seven columns in front; it was also pseudo-peripteral, *i. e.*, its surrounding columns did not stand free, but the wall was built up between them, the huge weight of the entablature making this necessary. Diodorus states that the "columns were built up in the same mass as the wall and all rounded externally, but with a square face to the interior of the temple," and this wall was pierced with windows. It differed in plan from all others in Sicily, for this outer walled and pillared enclosure was succeeded by a second one similar to it inside, and then came the cella within this, so that it was something like one of those Oriental boxes fitting one within another! Diodorus also gives the height to the top of the portico, exclusive of the basement, as 120 feet, so that it must have had a row of columns above the lower range. In length and width it must have been as large as St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and covered an area as large as that of Cologne Cathedral! Great portions of the side walls have fallen down, their stones lying in their relative positions. Those that remain of its thirty-seven or thirty-eight enormous pillars lie prostrate like a regi-

VOL. XXVI—6.

ment mowed down by some destructive artillery. Some of these measure nearly fifteen feet in diameter and have flutings twenty inches in breadth and deep enough to permit a man to stand within their groove. They rose fifty-five feet in height and their capitals are mighty blocks weighing at least twenty tons! Figures are very unsatisfactory to convey to the mind any conception of the real character of such a huge edifice as this must have been. Moreover, all measurements of buildings are never very accurate, being most difficult to obtain, and can only be approximate; still Polybius, Diodorus and other ancient writers give minute descriptions of this temple, whose magnificence they extol. Amidst the universal ruin lie colossal figures of Atlantes twenty-five feet in height that once stood before the pilasters of the cella, it may be, and one of these monsters has been reconstructed on the ground and lies like the mighty figure of Rameses II. at Memphis, only in thirteen disjointed blocks. The brown, weird giant is carved, too, in the severe style of Egypt with arms raised and stretched out, and seems like some Samson in the temple of the Philistines, who has gathered about him as his sepulchre the ruins of the great shrine in which he has been derided and has laid himself down in the midst of the catastrophe which he has created for the long sleep of the centuries.

Up to 1401 a considerable part of this temple was standing, but eventually earthquakes succeeded in dislodging its noble entablatures, capitals and columns, since no assistance had been given to the sterling art of the mason for eighteen centuries. In modern time the miserable mind of man has only been directed as to how best to transport stones that mock his imbecility in order to cast them into the sea to form a mole at the port of Empedocles, and this is the reason why the remains seem scant for so vast a structure.

From the elevation of the environing walls of the ancient temenos of the temple we look across gardens and undulating fields and may notice the piscina or fish pond mentioned by Diodorus with remains of the famous Cloacæ of Phæax. To the right are seen four Doric columns reërected by M. Cavallari, which recall a temple, probably that of Castor and Pollux, that once stood here, but these are all that remain of its thirty-four columns. Further on, where the ancient walls run by the side of the river Hypsas, are the stones of what is termed the temple of Vulcan, but there is little to induce the visitor to visit them.

Leaving the temple of Zeus we made our way along the ridge of rock that formed the city's bulwark, and have a succession of remarkable buildings. First comes the temple of Heracles, now like its fellow warder of the Golden Gate, utterly overthrown save one

solitary column. The disjointed stones of its pillars lie bleaching upon the ground like the articulations of some monster skeleton of pre-historic periods. In size and plan it must have resembled the Athenian Parthenon. The latter was 228 feet long without its steps; this was 241 feet with them. The Parthenon was 101 feet wide; this was ninety feet. The Parthenon was octastyle-peripteral, *i. e.*, with eight columns in front and rows on either side; this was hexastyle-peripteral, with only six. The height of the columns of Athene's temple is just over thirty-four feet, these thirty-three feet; their diameter in the former is more than six feet at the base, here it is seven feet. Here there are but thirty-eight Doric shafts; at Athens there are very many more, both large and small. It must, however, have been the most effective in appearance of all the temples of Agragas, next indeed to that of Zeus in position and size; it probably exceeded it in beauty. It is the earliest of all of them, as shown by the short and rapidly diminishing shaft, widespread abacus or capital and the bold curve of the echinus immediately below. Its restoration in Roman times did not improve it. Its sacred cella has an arrangement that is probably of this time, for it is quite unique, making it to consist of three chambers adjoining each other at the back. Xeuxis presented to this temple his famous picture of Alcmena, the mother of its hero-deity, for which he said he could accept no remuneration because it was priceless. Here, too, was the bronze statue of Heracles, another of those which "that man Verres" tried to carry off. A vivid description is given of the attempt by Cicero in his oration against the prætor. "There is a temple of Hercules at Agrigentum," he says, "not far from the forum, considered very holy and greatly revered among the citizens. In it there is a brazen image of Hercules himself, than which I cannot easily tell where I have seen anything finer; so greatly revered that his mouth and chin are a little worn away because men in addressing their prayers and congratulations to him are accustomed not only to worship the statue, but even to kiss it." Verres suddenly sent out a band of armed slaves one stormy night to attack the temple. The watchmen and guardians within its sacred precincts raise the alarm and endeavor to stop the invaders, but are driven in by bludgeons and stones; the bolts are forced, the doors are dashed in and they begin to endeavor to pull the statue off the pedestal, part of which may still be seen. They are pulling at it with ropes and making holes for their levers to get a purchase when the news is noised abroad. "No one in Agrigentum was either so advanced in years or so infirm in strength as not to rise up on that night, awakened by the tidings, and to seize whatever weapon chance put into his hands." They hurry to this temple, where for an hour the scoundrels had been

doing their best to overthrow the statue. The citizens rush in; the sacred close of the temple yard, lighted up with torches and lanterns, resounds with yells and blows, and eventually the robbers are driven away. Thus the statue was preserved from the infamous Verres, and "the Sicilians, who are never in such distress as not to be able to say something facetious and neat," remarked on this occasion that Hercules had added a fresh labor to those already accomplished, since he had conquered another boar (Verres—a boar) in the person of the prætor in addition to that of Erymanthus!

About three hundred yards further on in the same direction we come in succession to the two great temples that are erect, and if it be the first time that the visitor has seen one not a ruinous mass of stone, it will be a moment of thrilling enjoyment. Here we can trace for ourselves the cause of the effect produced in the mind without guessing at reconstruction. We feel at once the force of the beautiful law of proportion that pervades the whole, the exquisite simplicity, the natural sense of rhythmical beauty that must have been instinct to the builders, and this to an extent scarcely comprehensible to us. All this is so acutely and sensitively embodied in these stones that we naturally leave the language of architecture for that of its sister arts of literature and music and can only describe our feelings in such terms as a poem, a melody, an epic or a symphony; and after all it is rhythm that gives *form* to music and Scripture alike. Nor can we be in the presence of such works as these without being tempted to trace the intellectual and national disposition of the Greek mind as shown in the art they have bequeathed to us to the language they employed. To see how their conception of Order (*κόσμος*) is a convertible term with Beauty, as also with the great Universe of which we form a part, how to fulfil our appointed share in this universal order Beauty and Goodness must be intimately related (*καλοκαγαθία*), how the Happy man is he who stands well with his God (*εὐδαιμονία*), or even how Truth in word or work is incapable of oblivion (*ἀλήθεια*). Cannot we also see in the sublimely passionless, cold and statuesque character of these temples the same supreme sense of abstractedness that we feel in the characters of their ancient drama? The persons come before us as the creature of some stern, relentless Necessity, spell-bound by some mysterious power that fetters their free-will, impelling them to their doom. Religion was the source of their drama as it was of their art, and the frigidity of spirit, a certain uniformity or sameness, a certain recurrence of thought and expression, that pervade at least some of the realms of their ancient literature seem reproduced in their architecture. The humanity that pervades Gothic architecture is lacking in classic; in fact, is it not ethically the difference between the dread

goddess Ananké, Necessity or Fate, and the Christian doctrine of Free-Will? But to our subject.

The first of these temples is dedicated to a goddess of whose presence the men of Acragas were sadly in need, viz., Concordia, one of the charities of social life that seems to have been the most difficult for them to acquire, for in the checkered history of their town when it was not external attack that they had to combat it was perpetual internal dissension. The fair goddess of Concord must have sadly hardened her heart, for her votaries evidently charmed very sweetly to her in this temple. If the almighty Zeus and the god-like hero Heracles had as an offering the most extensive works of their hands, it was to Concord they raised the most completely beautiful and perfect specimen of Greek architecture extant on the island and perhaps in Europe. Harmonious and loveable as such a deity's shrine should be, it stands 138 feet long by 64 in width, with its thirty-four yellow sandstone shafts erect, six in front and rear and eleven on either side, with a circumference tapering from fifteen to nine feet and about twenty-three in height. Above them rise complete both architrave and pediments, and except it be the Theseum at Athens no more complete Doric temple is existing. Situated on the edge of the steep ridge of rock that forms the natural bulwark of the ancient city, it spoke aloud for peace, peace to invading Carthaginian and Roman as well as to the men of the once crowded Agora at its side; but alas! there was no peace. Yet we probably owe its preservation to times when all those who had reared its finished beauty had long passed away, when the lords of the height and the moiling crowds of the mart were alike hushed in death, when the market place had become an oliveyard and the paved streets terraces for fig and vine, and there arose another people who placed here the altar of the God of Peace Himself, choosing as their daysman the husbandman's patron saint of St. Gregory of the Turnips! Its sacred cella remains the most perfect in the island, its side walls pierced with circular openings made when it was used as a church, and instead of blaming Christianity for adapting temples to its uses as the too eager antiquary is often prompted to do, he should remember to be grateful at least here. In A. D. 399 Arcadius and Honorius commanded all the Greek temples to be destroyed and used to repair bridges, roads, city walls, aqueducts and the like, but those that could be used by the Christian communities were to be exempted from this decree. Our regret therefore should be that the Church did not take more of them than it did.

A walk of half a mile further on takes us along a road bordered by the ancient wall hewn out of the natural rock which Virgil saw from the sea (*Æn.* iii., 703), and this is honeycombed with niches

and tombs on its inner face now bereft of their marbles and their ashes. We come to the temple that is rather hesitatingly styled that of Juno Lacinia, magnificently situated at the southeast corner of the city's circuit, on the highest point of this rocky terrace that forms the last step down from the soaring crest of the Acropolis. The steep precipitous edge upon which it is placed is 390 feet above the level of the African sea that lies glittering in the sun $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles away, yet looking far nearer; and here the temple is raised upon a lofty stylobate or platform with a grand flight of steps leading to its eastern portico, and huge masses of the city wall upon its southern side. It is slightly earlier in date than that of Concord, very slightly smaller and in a less perfect condition. It is similar in design and in the number of its columns, but of these twenty-five only are now complete, the remainder being but half columns, and these reërected. Those on the south have been mainly injured by the scirocco blowing across the Mediterranean from the African deserts, and are more deteriorated than those on the north, which remain perfect, while little of the entablature is left. A portion of the pedestal upon which stood the statue of the goddess still is seen in the nave, and in front of this seats are observable for the purpose of viewing the sacrifice made to her. Sometimes this temple is called that of the Virgins, the reason given being that Xeuxis was asked to paint for it a picture of the Queen of the Gods and chose for his models five maidens of Girgenti from whom to form a perfect figure; but there is probably a confusion with a temple to Juno at Croton and a picture of Helen of Troy.

These temples are lighter in proportion than those of Egesta and Selinus and are therefore probably a little later in date. Diodorus states that they were all erected by means of the money obtained by the sale of the city's olive oil at Carthage, while the captives made in B. C. 480 (about the date of the temple of Juno) at the battle of Himera provided so large a number of slaves that they were no doubt employed in this work. Some of the citizens are said to have possessed 500 slaves apiece, and by their labor the subterranean canals, the fish ponds and temples would be formed; for quarrying stone was a very ready means of utilizing prison labor.

It was a saying of the ancients that the "Acragentines built as if they were to live forever and feasted as if they were to die to-morrow," and we may judge for ourselves, now more than 2,000 years after, how true the first part of the epigram was. We are not likely to be able to exceed in imagination the magnificence that this terrace of cathedrals must have displayed when these temples stood fair and perfect within a few yards of each other, nor should we be satisfied with simply inspecting their remains. It is a liberal educa-

tion to sit down amongst them and recall the history also of the wonderful city of which they only formed a part, and little is done if the visitor come but to mark the antithesis that the shrunken modern Girgenti presents to the mighty Acragas. We can scarcely at first realize that it was once the wonder of the island, and unless we have studied the history of the period in which it flourished we are unflushed with the enthusiasm that the scene about us should kindle.

The story of the fine buildings that once abounded at Acragas in the height of its pride, the prosperity and riches of its herding citizens, their affluence in statuary and paintings, the luxury and elegance of their homes are dwelt upon with delight by Diodorus the Sicilian. They had a short life and a luxurious one, but not a peaceful one by any means, for the city presents a singularly checkered career. From its foundation to its overthrow by the daughter of Tyre was only 174 years, and like Tyre, its fall is one of the most appalling disasters recorded in history. Twelve years after its foundation Phalaris, whose name is most familiar for his cruelty, had raised it to so high a pitch of splendor that it ranked at once as the second city of the island, but it rose in magnificence and beauty only to become besotted with luxury and to be finally cast down from the pinnacle of its glory. It allied itself with its conquerors, only to be destroyed by Rome. It transferred its fickle affections to Rome, only to be betrayed again to Carthage, and the intervals it filled up with mutual quarrel and dissension.

Two names will be uppermost in the minds of every visitor to Girgenti, viz., those of Phalaris and Empedocles, not because they are the most worthy of remembrance or the only distinguished ones in its history, but because they are the most romantic; for whilst few recall the wise ruler Theron, whose Romanized tomb is seen without the Golden Gate of the city, every schoolboy knows of Phalaris and his brazen bull and the leap into *Ætna* of Empedocles. It is unfortunate that the barbarities of Phalaris are so proverbial as to obliterate a due consideration of his ability as a ruler and a recognition that it was to him the city owed its rapid rise to the height of its magnificence. The vague use of the word tyrant is so entirely harmful in popular parlance that it sounds like a contradiction in terms to speak of a "benevolent and just tyrant." Yet in Greek republican days many such existed, for the word only means one who raised himself to kingly and autocratic power when a monarchy was not the recognized form of the Constitution. The cruelty of the tyrant Phalaris has become associated with all tyrants, but quite unjustifiably. Modern critical history is inclined to whitewash all sinners and blacken all saints; but while doing justice to the progress made under Phalaris it has been very doubtful as to the story

of his bull. Yet, as is usually the case with these ancient traditional tales, further investigation confirms them and we are now again told that this one is to be accepted. Pindar, writing only eighty years after the fall of the tyrant, is little likely to have spoken of this instrument of torture unless it had been notorious at the time, and he speaks of

Phalaris with blood defiled,
His Brazen Bull, his torturing flame,
Hand o'er alike to evil fame
In every clime.

Pyth. i., Cary's Trans.

Eventually this bull was carried to Carthage by the victors of Acragas, but restored again by Scipio Africanus, whom Cicero records as having said when he did so that "he thought it reasonable for the Acragentines to consider whether it was more advantageous to the Sicilians to be subject to their own princes or to be under the dominion of the Roman people when they had this as a monument of the cruelty of their domestic masters and of Roman liberality." (*Verres*. V. xxxiii.) The comparison, I fear, was a very weak one, especially with the rapacious and sacrilegious Verres as the representative of Roman generosity. The Castle of Licata, the ancient Phintias, was called Ecnomos the monstrous, from being the place where this bull was kept, but the figure now lies beneath the sands of the sea into which it was hurled. The Sicilian peasant retains it as prominently in his mind as do the youth of England, and you may see depicted upon one side of their pretty country carts the scene of Perillus being cast in the brazen oven with the ruler of Acragas near by, while some sacred story will adorn the second, a ballet dance be upon a third and King Roger fighting the Arab upon the fourth! There seems to have been an importation of Phœnician cruelty in the adoption of this punishment, which was so singularly unlike Greek practice, and perhaps in it we may trace some connection with the bull of the Herculean Melkart and the fires of Moloch. High up on the acropolis beneath the Church of Sta. Maria dei Greci we may see the columns of the most ancient temple in Acragas, within whose walls Phalaris himself may have stood making his offering to Zeus of the Atabyrian hill of Rhodes, while away at Ecnomos the air resounded with the bellowings of the victims of his displeasure.

We have no experience that enables us to vitalize the figure of these ancient despots, the awe and fear they inspired and the manner of their going are alike unknown to us, so that we cannot place them in fancy among the moving throngs about the temples and streets of the city. We probably greatly exaggerate and make quite an over-colored picture in our brain. But it is not so difficult to localize the presence of the philosopher Empedocles, the disciple of

the "long-haired Samian," Pythagoras. We have a part of his literary labors remaining to us and many descriptions indicative of his influence. They show him to have been poet, philosopher, naturalist, physician and philanthropist, yet penetrated with an all-consuming vanity that has made men skeptical as to whether the philosophy exceeded the charlatanism in his character. Roman scorn for all things Greek may have been the source of this, for the coarser fibred Latin had not only national and political prejudices, but a less finely strung mental endowment than the Greek. The Pythagorean was regarded probably as a magician for averting sickness by such simple remedies as modern times have revived, such as improved ventilation and drainage. The cutting through of the crest of the great wall of rock that connected the Acropolis with the Rupe Atenea was, according to local tradition, made by his advice, so that the Tramontana from the north might get through to the town on the south and dispel the malaria occasioned by its stagnant air. We may picture him in his robes of purple, his temples wreathed with the bay leaves of Apollo, and his feet shod with sandals of saffron and (they say) gold, charming a listening throng of the luxurious citizens with his eloquence and his reasoning from the natural world about him, as he sat in the bright sunshine within the precincts of one of these temples. In the beginning of one of his works—the Catharma—in which he urges moral conduct as the best medicine, we seem to see the vanity that has qualified his fame. "An immortal god and no longer a mortal man," he says, "I wander among you, honored by all, adorned with the priestly diadem and blooming garlands. Into whatever famous town I enter men and women do me reverence, and I am accompanied by thousands who thirst for their advantage, some being drawn to know the future and others tormented by long and terrible disease, waiting to hear the spells which will soothe suffering," etc., etc. And thus by the sad irony of fate in both cases—of Phalaris and Empedocles—it is the evil or the weakness in them that has lived the longest! Even in seeking his romantic death it is said that he desired to secretly disappear from amongst men so that, according to Lucian, as Milton says, he

to be deemed
A god, leaped fondly into Ætna flames.

Paradise Lost, iii.

But the very cauldron into which he cast himself punished his pride by ejecting one of those attractive sandals that he had been wont to display, and thus revealed the truth.

Deus immortalis haberi
Dumcupit Empedocles, ardentem frigidus Ætnam
Insiluit.

Hors. A. P., 464.

In the modern town of Girgenti, three or four miles from the

temples, there is nothing much to delay us. It occupies the ancient Acropolis only and the views from it are wonderfully beautiful and inspiring. The present population is about the same in number as is now that of its old compeer Syracuse, but in its prosperity the latter possessed no less than half a million and this about the same. The 22,000 modern inhabitants number 300 less than those taken prisoners by the Romans in the last siege of B. C. 262, yet children swarm everywhere. It is said to be the most prolific population in Italy or the island, and Fazzello mentions an Agrigentine woman who bore seventy-three children at thirty births! The people are now much employed in the sulphur works, but still we may see prevailing the solid, simple love of agricultural pursuits that marked the first Dorian settlers. But above all the memory will return to its magnificent panorama and to the scenes that are summoned to the stage of the mind's theatre as evening closes in and the sun sinks over western Lilybæum, Drepanum and Eryx; when under the influence of its reflective glamor upon the senses, we repeople again these Libyan waters, the deserted Agora and lonely temples, and we gaze down from the Rock of Athena over Girgenti *la magnifica*.

A. E. P. R. DOWLING.

London, England.

MICHAEL SERVETUS AND SOME SIXTEENTH CENTURY EDUCATIONAL NOTES.

FOR centuries before the so-called renaissance the University of Paris was a name to conjure with among the educated classes of every country in Europe. Even the greatest of the Minnesingers, Walther von der Vogelweide, in the famous contest on the Wartburg that has been immortalized by Wagner, boasted that he had been at the University of Paris. In the old poem attributed to him, "Die Zwölf Meister zu Paris"—"The Twelve Masters at Paris"—occurs a quotation that is of interest not only because of its reference to the University of Paris, but because it shows how much closer the old German was to the language of the Netherlands and at the same time nearer in many ways to our modern English. The quotation is: "Wil man fragen nach den wisosten pfafen die of ertrich sint die vindet man ze Paris in der schuol." "If a man is looking for the wisest teachers that exist on earth he must go to the schools in Paris."¹

¹ "Die Universitaet Paris und die Fremden an Derselben im Mittelalter." Von Dr. Alexander Budinszky, Professor an der Universitaet Czernowitz. Berlin: Hertz, 1876.

For centuries Paris deserved the reputation she enjoyed as the great centre of learning. Then, mainly as the result of possessing a sort of monopoly, and having too many privileges conferred on the faculty and too much power placed in their hands so that individual enterprise had no proper stimulus, the University lost much of its usefulness as a teaching institution. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, despite the fact that most of the great scholars of Europe thought it necessary to spend some time at the University of Paris, it does not seem to have been seriously fulfilling its educational mission. L'Abbe Paquier in an article on the University of Paris and the teaching of the humanities at the beginning of the sixteenth century says that there was practically no direct study of the Latin classics. The text-books used in the teaching of Latin were mainly certain works written in that language during the immediately preceding century. The principal ones among these were Despauteres Rudiments, the Floretus, or the Combat, of Thedulus or Theodatulus, and the Distichs of Jean Facetus.²

Latin was very commonly talked at the University, but the language in use would surely have made Cicero turn in his grave had he heard it. It was so bad that the German historian of the foreigners at the University of Paris, from whom we have quoted before, speaks of it as *Kauderwälsch*, an expressive German term for which we have no English equivalent, but whose signification would perhaps be best conveyed to English readers by some such expression as *hog Latin*, or *jargon*.

The main business of the University was the interminable discussion of sophistical questions of all kinds. Even law and medicine were taught by the discussion of hypothetical questions founded on the old authors in these branches. Medicine, for instance, was taught by taking a passage from Galen, the interpretation of which might reasonably, or unreasonably, be called into doubt, and then its different significations were discussed and arguments brought forward founded on quotations from other parts of the author's work. When this was true of so practical a subject as medicine, it can be easily understood how the argumentative system formed the basis in all other branches of education.

A quotation from a letter written by a student of the University at the time shows how far this foolish devotion to the disputation system had gone: "*Les inombrables cohortes de sophistes empechent tout progres. Dans une seance on n'en voulait pas peu a Adam de n'avoir pas mangé de poires au lieu de pommes.*" "The endless cohorts of sophists prevent all progress at the University. One lecture hour

² "Revue des Questions Historiques." New Series, Vol. XX. and XXI.; Article "L'Université de Paris, et L'Humanisme au Debut," XVI. eme Siecle, par L'Abbe Paquier.

was taken up with the question whether Adam was not to be seriously blamed by his descendants for not having eaten pears in place of apples." This passage occurs in a letter of Glarean's to Erasmus written August the 5th, 1510. It is to be found in the third volume of Erasmus' collected works.

Notwithstanding this unfortunate state of affairs, distinguished scholars still found their way to the University. Sir Thomas, afterwards Blessed Thomas More, having become embroiled with the English King, Henry VIII., by refusing to submit to his will in Parliament, had to resign his seat and found it advisable to spend several years on the Continent. At least one of those years was passed at the University of Paris. This was about 1510. It is interesting to note that he passed some time also at the University of Louvain and seems to have been quite taken with Netherlandish educational ways. More does not seem to have been very much impressed with the University of Paris, however. Later on, when the question of the education of his own children and those of friends was under discussion, he said that he knew no reason why they should be sent to Paris rather than to Oxford or to Cambridge.

Shortly before More's sojourn in the French capital, some time between 1505 and 1510, Erasmus of Rotterdam was at the University of Paris. We have no definite opinion of his with regard to the teaching value of educational methods at the University of Paris, though their neglect of Latin does not seem to have spoiled his own classic Latinity. For a number of years there were friends of Erasmus at the University of Paris, from whom he received letters containing accounts of events there. Most of his friends seem not to have been overmuch impressed with the value of Paris University training.

The reputation enjoyed by the University of Paris in the outer world may be gathered from two noteworthy incidents at the beginning of the sixteenth century. When Luther's doctrines first began to be a source of discussion, and consequently of religious discord in Germany, Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, applied to the faculty of the University of Paris for a decision with regard to their tenability. A little later, when Henry VIII., with Anne Boleyn already in view, wished to obtain a divorce from Catherine of Aragon, he also applied to the University of Paris for a decision with regard to the theological and ethical points at issue. These appeals for judgment give a better idea of the universal appreciation of the position of the University of Paris than any discussion of its actual value as an educational centre.

Most of the repute enjoyed by the University of Paris and the ele-

ment in its teaching that probably led Frederick and Henry VIII. more than anything else to make their applications was undoubtedly the well-known subtlety of its dialecticians. Surely, if ever, the days of the old sophists had returned here in Paris, and her logicians would have deserved very well the satirical pen of another Aristophanes for their unflinching efforts to make the worse appear the better part. This had become so remarkable that in 1530 the faculty of arts of the University of Paris confessed with sadness: "*L'Université était devenue la risée des nations étrangères par les subtilités de sa dialectique.*" "The University of Paris has become the laughing stock of foreign nations because of the subtlety of its dialectics."³

Very little improvement came in the teaching of the classics at the University of Paris until competition became a factor in arousing the dormant energies of university professors. About 1560 the Jesuits were allowed, by Papal rescript, to open the College de Clermont. After this the classics were better taught, for the Jesuits made them a special feature of their curriculum, and very soon raised the standard of the teaching of Latin all over Europe.

Jourdain, who takes up the history of the University of Paris in the sixteenth century where the old University Chronicler Boulay leaves off, apologizes for the condition of the University at the beginning of the sixteenth century and blames it on the unsettled state of the times. He says:

"Any one who knows the history of France well will surely recognize that there never was an age more disturbed by ideas and expectations of revolution and by warring diversity of opinion than the sixteenth century. Civil war lent all its acerbity to make these conditions more and more unbearable and to disturb the usual order of things."⁴

Notwithstanding all that has been said about the low standard of education at the University of Paris, the picture of University life at the beginning of the sixteenth century is not without its brighter side. For instance, Aleander's work in introducing Greek into the University must ever remain as a noble landmark in Western educational development. At the beginning of his career Aleander seems to have been very little appreciated. After an absence of several years, however, at a rival university he was recalled to become one of the bright lights of the University of Paris.

The neglect of the classics at the University of Paris was not with-

³ "Die Universitaet Paris und die Fremden an Derselben in Mittelalter." Von Dr. Alexander Budinszky, Professor an der Universitaet Czernowitz. ⁴ Cuillibet Gallicæ Gentis annales investiganti nullam unquam aetas occurrit quæ novarum rerum studio et expectatione variis opinionum adversarum concertationibus diuturna belli plus quam civilis atrocitate. Magis elata fuerit magisque exagitata et afflicta quam seculum sextum decimum. "Index Chronologicus Chartarum Pertinetium ad Historiam Universitatis Parisiensis. Studio et cura Caroli Jourdain." Supplement to the History of the University of Paris by Jourdain.

out its compensations in other ways. To the emptiness of educational ideals we doubtless owe the fact that Francis Xavier, the brilliant young professor at the College Dormans-Beauvais for several years during the third decade of the century, was ready to give up his professorship and follow Ignatius of Loyola, whose acquaintanceship he had made at the university on the quixotic mission to the Holy Land. Their mission proved not to be *in partibus infidelium*, but in the very heart of the Church itself. The foundation of the great teaching order that was to reform education and, incidentally, revolutionize the methods of classical teaching at the University of Paris was to result from this unnoticed movement among a few Spanish students.

Ignatius himself spent the six years between 1528 and 1534 at the College Sant Barbe. In the latter year he received there the degree of Master of Arts. Laynez and Salmeron, Lefevre and Rodriguez, the other original members of the Society of Jesus, were, like Francis Xavier, acquaintances made by Ignatius during his course at the University.

There were always a good many Spaniards in attendance at the University of Paris, and the autumn after Ignatius and his companions left on their pilgrimage Michael Servetus, who came, as did Ignatius himself and Francis Xavier, from the Spanish provinces near the Pyrenees, took up the study of medicine at the University. Servetus came from Villanueva in Aragon, and he is sometimes known as Michael Villanueva. He was only 25 when he came, but he had already signalized himself by a tendency to independent thinking. After only two years of the study of medicine he set up as a lecturer on the subject himself.

One of the beneficial results of the exaggerated tendency to fritter away time on what the faculty of the University rather leniently and euphemistically called "the subtleties of dialectics" was that more attention than was usual at Universities of that period was devoted by serious students to the practical professions of law and medicine and to original investigation in the nascent physical sciences.

Servetus' favorite teacher at the University of Paris was Vesalius. Vesalius was a young man, but he had already accomplished some of that work in anatomy which deservedly gained for him the title of "Father of Anatomy." Vesalius had been attracted to Paris by the reputation of Sylvius, whose name and fame are bound up with the subject of brain anatomy. One of the most important fissures in the brain, near which lie the great motor centres, is called the Sylvian fissure because of its discovery and description by this distinguished University of Paris professor. Vesalius was especially noted for his dissections while at the University of Paris, and most of the material

for his famous work, "*De Humani Corporis Fabrica*," was obtained during his work at the University.

These early years of the sixteenth century practically saw the beginning of the modern inductive sciences. The observations from which the great principles of the succeeding centuries were to be drawn were being made in many places throughout Europe. When Vesalius left the University of Paris it was to continue his studies in anatomy in Italy, especially at Bologna and Padua. In Italy he was brought intimately into association with men like Eustachius and Fallopius, whose names are forever attached to structures in the human body which they were the first to describe.

The plates for Vesalius' great work are probably the best anatomical illustrations that have ever been prepared. There has always been a discussion as to the artist who assisted Vesalius in his work. A reasonably well founded tradition exists to the effect that their designer was no less a personage than Titian, the Venetian artist. Titian is known to have been a friend of Vesalius, and the plates are worthy even of his reputation. His artistic interest in anatomy would have been sufficient to encourage him to undertake the work. Its accomplishment would really have been a labor of love, a precious bit of training for his artistic development. It was but shortly before this time that that other of the greatest artists, Leonardo da Vinci, numbered among manifold attainments a wonderfully exact knowledge of human anatomy and insisted that the artist must possess this knowledge to be successful.

Everywhere were the signs of the awakening of that spirit of investigation of nature and enthusiasm for independent observation which was to prove the origin of modern science. Bacon, who lived at the end of this century and the beginning of the next, is often spoken of as the father of the inductive sciences. By a curious misconception in history it not infrequently happens that the collator of the work of others becomes, to posterity, the originator of ideas of which he was only an especially impressionable recipient. Bacon himself was not a scientist in any true sense of the word, and his work consisted only of the expression and arrangement of the principles of observation that had been, long before his time, applied by men who were real scientific discoverers.

Into what unexpected dangers the pursuit of science might bring a devotee may be gathered from Vesalius' career. He gave up his position of anatomist at the University of Paris in order to become the private physician of Philip II. of Spain. He gave excellent satisfaction and continued his anatomical work whenever the opportunity offered. One of his patients, a prominent nobleman, died of some disease that Vesalius could not explain. He asked and ob-

tained permission from the family to make an examination of his internal organs in order to find out the cause of death. He allowed some friends of the deceased to be present while he was making the autopsy. They either saw, or thought they saw, life in the dead body after Vesalius made his incision for examination purposes. How easy it would be for the lively imagination of friends to persuade them that motion occurred where there really was none? It may have been that Vesalius mistook one of the cases of cataleptic trance which sometimes simulate death so completely as to make their recognition extremely difficult.

However that may be, for his unintentional homicide he was condemned to death. The sentence was commuted by Philip II. to a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre. This Vesalius made successfully, but on his return he was shipwrecked on the Island of Zante and died as a consequence of the exposure and over fatigue. His death took place October 15, 1564, when he was only 50 years of age and when there was still promise of great advances in anatomy at his hands.

It was during this transitional period that the future martyr for heresies on the Trinity came to Paris. Under the inspiration of Vesalius' example, and very probably with his personal guidance and assistance, Servetus devoted himself to human anatomy with great enthusiasm. Besides Vesalius, Servetus came under the influence of Sylvius, whose work had made him famous throughout Europe and whose success would prompt the ambitious young Spaniard to hard work. At the end of two years Servetus received his license to practice, after having demonstrated before the faculty his ability to defend a set of theses from Galen's works. He would be said in modern terms to have carried off the honors of his class. *Vix ulli secundus cognitione Galeni*—scarcely second to any in his knowledge of Galen—was the verdict of the faculty of the University after they had listened to his brilliant disputation.

As we have already said, the training in medicine given by the University consisted in these disputations. The study of patients was very little encouraged. It was much more important in the eyes of the medical faculty to know the various passages in Galen's works that referred to a special type of disease than to have seriously investigated the individual symptoms that a series of patients might present. With this verdict of the faculty, then, as the stamp of his knowledge of medicine Servetus was ready to set up as a lecturer at the University immediately after his graduation.

There was a large number of students at the University at this time, some ten thousand altogether, and as the courses taken were

not arranged in the methodical fashion usual at universities now, it was not hard for a young lecturer to get a set of pupils. Servetus was especially favored by the fact that he came from the Pyrenees region in Spain, for there were, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, a large number of Spanish students from this region in Paris. Of this the best evidence is that such men as Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Xavier, and Laynez and Salmaron had gone out of their own country in order to complete their education at Paris. There seems to have been not a little national solidarity. Servetus proved to be a very popular lecturer, and, as events shortly showed, made many friends among those in attendance at the University.

His special application to the study of Galen during his undergraduate years does not seem to have given him that exclusive reverence for that master's work which was usually imbibed by the students of the period. His tendency to think for himself very soon manifested itself. During the course of his professorship at Paris he published a book on the use of syrups in medicine, in which he completely broke away from Galenic traditions with regard to the treatment of disease.

It is characteristic of the temper of the times that the publication of this book almost led to serious disturbance in the University. Members of the faculty took different sides as to the advisability of allowing the book to appear under the ægis of the University or permitting its author to teach any longer within the precincts of Paris, or with the sanction of the University authorities. To break with established tradition in any line of knowledge was a serious matter. Any departure from the teachings of the ancients was a sort of heresy. Heresy meant choice of doctrine, and there was to be no picking nor choosing of the dogmas that were to be taught in the University in any department. Everything was to be regulated by authority, and the authority in medicine was Galen, whose *ipse dixit* must be regarded as infallible and must be maintained at all cost.

It is a pregnant sign of the times that there were enough of the reactionary party in the faculty of the University and among the students to support Servetus in his risky declaration of independence of thought. For a long time, however, the situation at the University was very tense. Many a hard word was bandied, and there was even rioting on the street and some serious injuries were inflicted. Servetus refused to withdraw his book, and finally was allowed to maintain his position. Peace, however, was not fully restored until after a decree of Parliament had made it a penal offense to discuss in public, either *pro* or *con*, certain of the mooted points that had been brought up by the controversy.

Those were days when people took themselves and their ideas very

seriously. When individuals held opinions they seemed always ready to fight for them, no matter how trivial the subject matter of the opinions might be. Controversies over disputed points in which ordinarily sane men of later times can see nothing of importance might easily lead, and did often actually lead, to bloodshed. Parliaments and municipal councils in most of the cities of Europe had for this reason often to interfere by formal decrees in what seemed purely academic discussions of the most impractical and impersonal character.

Controversy of all kinds took on an acerbity that we can scarcely comprehend in the midst of our lackadaisical indifferentism. Culture has at least brought this benefit in its train that we have learned to conceal our impatience in public with those who disagree with us. During the sixteenth century mere wordy discussions, in which opponents were really disputing over nothing more serious than a differing assumption of significance in terms, were prone to become extremely bitter. Towards the end of the century zealous churchmen, representative members of great educational institutions, could scarcely disagree over a minor point in theology without accusing one another of unnatural crimes and impugning one another's ancestry.

As the result of his first book and certain letters in which he criticized Calvinistic doctrine, a lively epistolary discussion ensued between Calvin and Servetus, in which some extremely bitter things were said on both sides. The general impression outside of Switzerland, or rather outside the pale of Calvin's influence, seemed to have been that Calvin got the worst of it in the dispute. For this he never forgave Servetus. It was evidently personal rancor, rather than religious zeal, that prompted the Genevan reformer to take advantage of his power and put Servetus to death, when, by an unfortunate combination of circumstances, his young opponent fell into his hands.

The odium theologicum, so characteristic of the time, can be gathered very well from some of the courtesies that passed between these two representatives of sacred truth, as they considered themselves, during the course of their discussion. "Calvin was so incensed against Servetus" (as the result of this epistolary discussion) "that he could not forbear to revile him in his commentaries upon the Bible. He calls him a 'profligate fellow' (*un meschant garnement*), 'full of pride and a dog.' This is in the edition of the year 1553, in the commentary upon the first verse of the first chapter of St. John's gospel. Calvin wrote those words before Servetus came to Geneva, for the epistle dedicatory (of this edition) is dated January first, 1553. In 1546 Calvin had written to Farel a letter in which he says: 'I

am informed that Servetus is coming hither (to Geneva), on purpose to have some conversation with me. If I have any influence on the magistrates of Geneva, I will take effectual care that he never goes from hence alive.'"⁵

The next century was not very old before two learned and presumably phlegmatic Dutchmen became embroiled in a discussion over a Greek enclitic particle. Before the controversy was ended, we may say, by the way, that it was never decided, these two most distinguished classical scholars in Europe provided an exhibition of give and take in Latin Billingsgate that has amused students of the classics ever since and been a precious mine for terms of contempt and slang abuse couched in classical latinity.

Those were dangerous times in which to indulge in the luxury of original ideas. We may still be of the profound conviction that people who disagree with us in important ethical principles are insincere. But we do not consider that they deserve to be hanged, drawn and quartered, or to be burned until dead for their opinions. In the sixteenth century, however, the spirit of intolerance ran very high. Men were only beginning to realize that they need not necessarily follow the lines of thought laid out for them by Plato and Aristotle and Hippocrates and Galen. The consciousness that they could think straight for themselves without consulting authority on every subject apparently aroused in men's minds the conviction that when others took the same liberty and came to conclusions different from theirs, then those who disagreed with them must be wrong and deserved to be punished.

Of Servetus' treatise on syrups, over which there was so much disturbance, it may be said that it represents a distinct advance in the prescribing of drugs. To the casual medical reader of the present day it is an insoluble problem why there should have been so bitter a controversy over the book. It is, of course, a marked departure from Galen and Galenic methods of treatment. This departure is, however, distinctly in the line of advance. There are many falsities, of course, but some of Servetus' ideas were to be adopted by the medical profession generally before very long. This book contains the first suggestion of the proper employment of vehicles in prescriptions, that is, of solutions tasty and pleasant smelling which, while of no special service in themselves, are useful because they enable other drugs to be held in solution. The book contains some of the first steps in progress away from the nauseous mixtures that were so

⁵ These quotations are from "An Impartial History of Michael Servetus, Burned Alive at Geneva for Heresy." Anonymous. London, Printed for Aaron Ward at the King's Arms in Little Britain, 1724. The book is rare, but there is a copy of it in the Library of the Academy of Medicine of New York City and another in the library of the Catholic Summer School, the latter a donation from the New York Academy of Medicine.

popular during mediæval times. The principles on which Servetus suggests the making of syrups would eliminate the tendency to precipitation of drugs, so common in the old mixtures, and laid the first principle by which the mingling of incompatible ingredients could be avoided.

It is surprising to think that this work could have been accomplished by a man whose main purpose was not practical, but eminently theoretic. It must have required a number of experiments and a considerable amount of careful observation to secure the data necessary for the detailed information the book contains. The faculty of observation was, in fact, the strong side of Servetus' mind. When he wandered into the realm of theory and metaphysics he fell into egregious errors difficult to understand. Unfortunately, however, as is so often the case, instead of cultivating his most promising faculties, he looked for his fame from the employment of powers that had not been granted him.

All through his books we find the marks of his acute and accurate powers of observation. We shall have occasion to remark on the great discovery of the minor circulation which he made as the result of his dissecting work. He ignored the value of these precise observations so much that it is only when his knowledge of supposedly unknown facts is introduced casually and for the purpose of illustrating phases of his metaphysical speculations that we know anything of his having made them.

Deeply interested as Servetus must have been in his scientific medical work, in various departments, it is not a little difficult to explain why he should have left Paris to take up the position of an ordinary practitioner of medicine in the provinces. It may well have been that financial reasons weighed most in influencing his decision. Lecturers at the University of Paris were but illy paid, and while money was not nearly as important a consideration in those days as in ours, this reason might well have its weight with a young man who found himself rather unpopular with one faction of the University faculty and so could not look for rapid promotion.

It has been suggested that there may have been a woman in the case. At the time when Servetus was teaching at the University of Paris, and for most of the century that followed, the old mediæval monastic tradition with regard to bachelor professors still continued in vogue. No one of the teaching staff of the University was allowed to be married. This was true not only for the members of the faculties of arts and letters and theology, departments which more properly belonged to monastic teachers, but was insisted upon also for the members of the faculties of the schools of medicine and law. It was not until 1600 that the professors of medicine, who were

usually at the same time, as they are at present, practicing physicians in the city of Paris, were allowed to take to themselves wives, without resigning their University professorship. This regulation of enforced bachelorhood remained in effect for even the lay professors in the other faculties until nearly the middle of the seventeenth century.

It is almost needless to say that these regulations, which concerned also the students of the University, none of whom were allowed to be married, did not conduce to the morality of the University quarter of the town. Many of the traditions of the notorious Quartier Latin come down from the days when these University regulations were in force. They account for some of the queer University decrees in which there is evidence of what to us seems a totally unwarranted compounding with vice.

Whether the proverbial woman in the case had anything to do with Servetus' removal from Paris is extremely doubtful. We have no record of his marriage. Some years later there are obscure references to a proposal of marriage on his part, but the data are so incomplete as to leave the issue of the marital negotiations in doubt. The trouble over his book may well have provided pretext enough to leave Paris gladly.

When the Bishop of Vienne and Dauphiny offered him the post of private physician, Servetus accepted it. His idea very probably was to obtain time for what would in our day be called literary labor. In his active brain, unshackled by traditions, many thoughts were seeking expression. At that time no one amounted to anything in the educational world unless he had written something on theological subjects. The air was full of controversy. Every one who presumed that he could think straight on any subject felt impelled to dabble in theological discussion. Servetus' first work had been published several years before his connection, either as student or professor, with the University of Paris. It had attracted considerable attention because of its hardihood and the fact that its author was scarcely beyond his majority. The subject taken was the loftiest in theology, and the method of treating it was the form least calculated to make friends for its author. Its title was "*De Trinitatis Erroribus*." Something of the avidity with which such books were read may be gathered from the fact that the second edition of the book was called for within a year after its first publication. This second edition was revised and enlarged and received the title "*Dialogorum de Trinitate, Libri Duo*."

It might have been hoped that Servetus' devotion in the meantime to serious anatomical and medical studies would have taken him out of the dangerous field of theological discussion. As a

matter of fact, it seems to have had this effect for a number of years. For some years Servetus devoted his spare time to editing scientific books of various kinds for a publisher in Lyons not far from Vienne. Among other books which he edited was the geography of Ptolemy. This seems to have been a popular book, for a second edition was called for within a year or two. Servetus' notes on the geography of Ptolemy are eminently characteristic of the man. He rises above the limited circle of ideas of the old geographer to see the wide relations that geography may have with all the sciences. While Ptolemy's descriptions and maps were concerned only with political, and to a certain extent with physical, geography, Servetus conceived the idea that the science of the description of the earth should be made to include scientific data of various kinds, botanical, zoological, astronomical, according to the varying physical phenomena to be found in different parts of the known world. As a consequence of this broad view of the application of geography, Servetus has been called by a number of good authorities the Father of Comparative Geography.

In the meantime Servetus seems to have been careful not to neglect his medicine. There is an account of his having taken several courses at the University of Montpellier, whose medical faculty has been distinguished almost as far back as the history of universities in Europe extends. These intervals of attendance at the University of Montpellier may very well have occurred during the absence of the Archbishop of Vienne, either on a journey to Paris or to Rome, for Servetus continued to hold his post of body physician to that prelate. In 1545 the Council of Trent began its session and the absence of the Archbishop at some of the sessions of the Council may have given Servetus opportunities for scientific work at the University of Montpellier, which was somewhat easier to reach and had none of the forbidding associations of Paris.

About the middle of the decade, 1540 to 1550, Servetus was tempted once more to enter the field of theological discussion. He denied some of the doctrines of Calvin, and this led to a discussion with the Geneva reformer in which the usual absence of amenity on both sides is the distinguishing characteristic. That this discussion did not cause him to neglect his practice as a physician is evident from the fact that when, a few years later, the authorities of Vienne wished to arrest and imprison him because of his book, which was deemed to be heretical, they found it very easy to secure his imprisonment by summoning him as if to see a sick prisoner, and then retaining him under duress.

It was not until 1553 that Servetus published the book which caused his death. There is only one complete copy of the first edi-

tion of that book in existence. It is one of the world's bibliophilic treasures, and is in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris. There is an imperfect copy, the only other example of the first edition that is known to be in existence, in the Imperial Library of Austria at Vienna. The Paris copy was purchased by the *Bibliothèque Nationale* through an English agent in Louis XIV.'s time. The price then paid for it was 13,000 francs, about \$2,600. Its value at the present time, of course, can scarcely be computed.

Besides being the only perfect copy of a first edition the book is interesting for other reasons. It belonged for a number of years to the library of Dr. Richard Mead, the most famous English physician of his time. Dr. Mead, himself a prolific writer in medicine, and Chief Physician to the English Court, was a great friend of the literary men of his time, and included among his intimates such men as Pope, Johnson, Hogarth and others. Mead was very much interested in Servetus, and began the publication of an edition of this book which was to be in every way a replica of the original edition. He did not live to complete his work, though there were some copies of an edition of Servetus, imitating the original in every way, issued shortly afterward in Holland.

There is a tradition that the volume owned by the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris is the original copy that was used by the public prosecutor at Geneva for the abstraction of the passages that were used at Servetus' trial to demonstrate the heresies contained in the book. There are certain brownish patches here and there on the edges of the leaves that look as though they would crumble at the touch and certain parts that have actually crumbled. These are pointed out as marks of the fire in which the unfortunate author of the book perished. For there is a tradition that this copy was deposited on the funeral pyre to be burned with Servetus in accordance with the decree of the Court at Geneva. It is supposed to have been rescued by some one whose zeal was not exactly according to Calvin and to have been sent to England to avoid the danger that might well come from its possession in either France or Switzerland at the time.

The book is not in the original binding, and so the question of its having been singed by fire is hard to decide. There seems no good reason to think that the Geneva copy escaped the holocaust prepared for it. Unfortunately for the picturesque tradition, recent investigation seems to show that the crumbly patches are only the result of mildew.

The visitor to the Museum of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* will still be told, however, that this is the public prosecutor's copy saved from the flames. I have even heard one of the best known members of

the medical faculty of the University of Paris, Professor Charles Richet, the distinguished physiologist, state in a public lecture his belief in the old tradition with regard to this being the public prosecutor's copy.

The book was published without either author or publisher's name on the title page. Servetus realized the danger which his notions on the Trinity made him incur. The title of the book is a curiosity in itself. It runs:

CHRISTIANI-
SMI Restitu-
TIO.

arranged exactly in the way we have placed it here. The whole of the title is "CHRISTIANISMI RESTITUTIO, Totius Ecclesiae Apostolicae est ad sua Limina Vocatio, in Integrum Restituta Cognitione Dei, Fidei Christi Justificationis Nostrae Regenerationis Baptisme et Caenae Domini Manducationis. Restitutum Denique Nobis Regno Coelesti, Babylonis Captivitate Soluta et Anti-Christo Cum Suis Penitus Destructo."

They were not sparing of words in their titles in those days, and the peculiar division of the first and principal words of the title, which are in large capitals, show how near we are to the incunabula of printing.

The anonymity of the book as regards author and publisher did not save Servetus, however. The book was condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities and search made for the writer. When it was discovered that Servetus was the author it was resolved to throw him into prison in order to await the action of the civil authorities. There seems to have been some hesitancy as to the legal status of this decision, or else there was fear that if Servetus were served publicly with a warrant his friends might find some way to warn him before being brought to prison. Perhaps the ecclesiastical authorities had no formal agents to carry out their decrees. As a consequence Servetus was inveigled to prison by the scheme which has been mentioned. Utterly unsuspecting, he answered the call of professional duty that brought him presumably to see a sick prisoner and then was detained in prison.

The most remarkable feature of Servetus' life is the number of friends he made and the readiness they displayed in supporting him in difficult and dangerous circumstances. At the University of Paris during his trouble with the University authorities this is especially manifest. That he had succeeded in making many friends in Vienne also we have hinted already in a suggested explanation of the stratagem employed to get him to prison. These friends were not numerous and powerful enough to assure his acquittal, but they suc-

ceeded in enabling Servetus to escape from prison. Servetus at once made his way out of France with the purpose of eventually reaching Naples, where he had some Spanish friends, on whose protection he could rely. On the way to Naples, unfortunately for him, he delayed for a day or two at Geneva.

Perhaps he was tempted to see for himself some of the political conditions that surrounded Calvin and that he hoped to do this incognito. The most important characteristic of the quasi-republican government at Geneva under Calvin's influence was the fact that nearly every second person was a spy, ready to furnish information spontaneously, or for a proper reward, to the authorities. The Protestant reformer, who believed that a certain number of the human race were predestined to damnation and could not by any effort of their own secure their salvation, acted up to his belief in practical life. He utterly distrusted those around him, and by a system of extensive espionage hoped to secure the subservience of the people and their fidelity to his religious tenets.

Servetus was recognized, arrested and thrown into prison. He lay in prison for some time until the Council of Geneva had been properly prepared to give him the benefit of the sternest justice. This seems to have required no little persuasion on Calvin's part. The trial lasted for nearly two months. The reformer's bitter hatred, however, of the man who had made him ridiculous in controversy finally succeeded in winning the Judges over to his own cruel decision. Servetus was condemned to death, his death to be on the funeral pyre.

On October the 14th, 1553, the sacrifice was consummated. There is a tradition that the wood used for the pyre was green and did not burn well. When the match was first put to it, it flared up and for the moment it seemed to be all over with the young reformer whose life was ending thus unhappily at the age of 42. In the first moment of pain Servetus cried out in Spanish, in a voice evidently directed to heaven: "Misericordias! Misericordias!" "Mercy! Mercy!" Then, as the slow burning wood failed to put him out of agony at once, he was heard to pray: "Jesus, Son of the Eternal God, have mercy on me." In order to hasten his death, the executioner seems to have been directed to rearrange the burning wood. This is supposed to have given the opportunity for the rescue of the book, which was condemned to be burned with its author.

It would be absurd to blame Calvin alone for the death of Servetus. The execution was really the outcome of the intolerance of the Protestantism of the time. Many of the reformers of that day supported the action of Calvin and wrote him letters commending the course pursued by the Council of Geneva. Zwinglius was outspoken in his

commendation of Calvin's action. Martin Butzer, of Strasbourg, and Oikolampadius, of Basle, publicly expressed their justification of Servetus' execution. Even the gentle Melancthon, mildest of the reformers, sent letters of congratulation to Calvin on the pious deed he had done that would form "a memorable example for posterity." Alexander Hales said "that the citizens of Geneva had deserved well of all the churches by overcoming the new Mahomet, whose invasion of Christianity was even more dangerous than the Eastern Prophet's had been."⁶

As the result of the death of Servetus a reaction set in among all classes with regard to execution for written or spoken heresy. The spirit of this reaction is best expressed by some famous sentences of Castalion, a Professor at the University of Basle at the time. Castalion in a public letter addressed to the authorities at Geneva said:

"To kill a man is not to defend any doctrine; it is only to kill a man. The magistrates of a city are bound in duty to protect the life and property of its citizens. As to the defense of truth, that is not the business either of the magistrate or of the executioner. It concerns the teacher and the pastor. When a heretic attacks religion only by words and arguments, religion must be defended only by arguments and words, that is to say, by purely spiritual arms."

In general the effect of Servetus' death was to produce a new point of view with regard to freedom of speech and writing. Under the circumstances one cannot help but recall the famous self-sacrifice of the monk, Telemachus, in order to stop the gladiatorial shows that continued to be held even under the Christian Emperors. Servetus, of course, did not anticipate any such happy consequence of his sad fate, and yet his execution foreordained quite as effectually as the sad fate of Telemachus put an end to the human sacrifices of the arena the abolition of the death penalty for heresy. The ardent young scientist might have met a kindlier fate for his foolish overzeal, but scarcely one that would have satisfied him more could he have foreseen its eventual results for science and thought.

Servetus was one of those unfortunate men, enviable geniuses to posterity, but uncomfortable human beings in their relations to their

⁶ These quotations are from the article "Charakterbild Michel Servetis, von Henri Tollin," contained in Virchow's "Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Vorträge," Eleventh Series, No. 254. ⁷ This seems to be the first formal expression ever made of the right of liberty of speech and writing in matters of religion. It thus reflects the first ray of the dawn of the era to which we have grown accustomed. For this reason the passage in its succinct entirety seems worth quoting in the original. "Tuer un homme ce n'est pas défendre une doctrine ce n'est que tuer un homme. Le magistrat doit défendre la vie et les biens des citoyens, quant à défendre la vérité c'est l'affaire non du magistrat ni du bourreau, mais du docteur, et du pasteur. Quand un herétique n'attaque la religion que par des paroles et des arguments il ne faut la défendre que par des arguments en des paroles c'est à dire par des armes jurement spirituelles." Quoted from Article "Servetistes" in the Dictionnaire La Rousse.

fellow-men. His career occurred when "the times were out of joint," and he thought that he was born "to set them right." Had he come in the nineteenth century he would surely have been recognized as an independent thinker, would have been hailed probably as the founder of a new school of philosophic thought, would have tried to reconcile science and religion with sufficient leaning towards science to make him mildly suspect of heresy, and would have "lived happy ever after." In the sixteenth century he was eminently out of place, and his unfortunate end was the result.

One of the most surprising things in his book on the Trinity is to find the first description of the pulmonary circulation that was ever penned, brought in as a figure that he thought would serve to make clear some of the ideas evolved in this conception of the Trinity and the relations of the Divine Persons to one another. When Servetus came to talk of the Holy Spirit animating the other persons of the Trinity, he compares it to the air animating the flesh through the blood in this human trinity that constitutes man.

The vital spirit, he says, "is generated by the mixture in the lungs of the inspired air with the subtly elaborated blood, which the right ventricle sends to the left. The communication between the ventricles, however, is not made through the midwall of the heart, but in a wonderful way the fluid blood is conducted by a long detour from the right ventricle through the lungs, where it is acted on by the lungs and becomes red in color, passes from the arteriac venosa into the vena arteriosa, whence it is finally drawn by the diastole into the left ventricle."

A better description of the lesser or pulmonic circulation could not be written in our own day, and yet this was printed 150 years before Harvey "discovered" the circulation of the blood. This does not detract from the value of Harvey's wonderful synthetic work, but it serves to show that, like all great discoveries, the realization of the circulation of the blood was not the sudden inspiration of an individual intellect, but a gradual evolution of human opinion, finding its first clear and culminating expression in the mind of a genius. After that expression has come, it behooves posterity not to forget the names, or the labors, of the men who paved the way for genius and made possible the great step of advance.

When one reads the involved, cloudy style of Servetus in other parts of his book on the Trinity, and is hampered by the obscurity in which Servetus' ideas are constantly wrapt up, and then stumbles suddenly on this passage of pure physical science, expressed so succinctly and completely, one is almost tempted to believe that the passage is a surreptitious later addition made by another hand. The description of the pulmonary circulation, however, is to be found

in the original edition preserved in the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris, with its perhaps fire-charred edges and the name of the Prosecutor Colladon going down to an infamous immortality on its fly leaf.

Poor Servetus is a characteristic representative of a tendency that has always existed in scientific men, especially in those whose investigations carry them beyond the bounds of knowledge as fixed up to their time. Another striking example of this tendency was manifest in Galileo about fifty years later, at the beginning of the seventeenth century. To these men there came, unfortunately, the seductive idea that the methods that have served to widen human science and light up its obscurities will surely accomplish a similar purpose in theological science. A corollary of this belief is the feeling that their own scientific attainments will help to illustrate theology and illumine its obscurities. Scientific men down to our own time have felt sure that their successful investigations demanded a serious modification of theological tenets. They have been surprised if a reformation has not been at once undertaken in existing beliefs and an alteration of accepted dogmata. When conservative churchmen have, unaccountably as it seemed to their scientific minds, hesitated to begin the reform, they have been ready and eager to point the way.

The old dogmata remain unshaken despite the scientific advances of three centuries and a half since Servetus' death. Scientific men, in constant succession since his time, have each in turn, with certain noteworthy exceptions, felt the impulsion to invade the domain of theology. All of them who have done so have aroused enmity; none of them have done any direct good. The precious lesson *suum cuique* has not been learned. The acerbity of feeling that characterized the resistance to earlier unwarranted invasions on the part of as yet inchoate science has died out. There remain, as the heritage of the past, a precious warning for later times, the inevitable errors of the scientist *supra crepidam* impatient for religious reform. Some of the theological errors of the latter day scientist are quite as inexplicable as the obscure wanderings of Servetus with regard to the Trinity. The experience of the past will not, however, prevent others from taking up theological discussion to their discomfiture, and so the world goes on learning from the past, but so slowly and with so many a swing of the pendulum of opinion in reverse direction that intellectual progress seems almost negative to an impatient generation hoping for so much for humanity and attaining so little in the span of one human life.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York, N. Y.

THE SUPERNATURAL.

STUDENTS of ecclesiastical history have said that nearly all the heresies in the Church took their rise in some confusion of notions with regard to what is called the natural and the supernatural order of things. If this be so, we need not be surprised to find that this want of clearness of apprehension should lead to errors of the most opposite kinds. And so we do. Certainly the narrow rigor of Jansenism seems to be the very antipodes of that tendency to broad liberality which is the apprehended religious danger of the present day. And yet this confusion is at the root of both these schools of error. In the letter of our Holy Father condemning this liberalism, or disposition to liberalism, he says: "It is hard to understand how those who are imbued with Christian principles can place the natural above the supernatural virtues, and attribute to them greater power and fecundity." Therefore, according to the Holy Father, there are some men at the present time whose ideas are so obscure on this subject that they appear actually to place the natural virtues higher in their estimation than those of the supernatural order. Now what about the Jansenists? Thus Jansenius expresses himself in the introduction to his famous work: "God had to create the first man perfect like the angels, not only innocent, but positively pure, good and holy or happy. This is original grace, which consequently is *natural* to man; it is given to him essentially by and with creation, not as an additional gift." A more radical error could not have been invented; the whole Christian idea of grace is destroyed by making it something due to nature.

Nothing is more clear than the doctrine of the Catholic Church on grace. Nevertheless it is not generally very much explained or developed to our children or the people. The more exterior dogmata of religion are dwelt upon at length. This part of our belief which is innermost in our faith, the soul, so to say, of our doctrine, is, to a great extent, passed over or at least is not exposed very minutely. The writer of this article at one time wished to give a course of instructions on the seven capital sins or vices. He came to envy. Now envy is as existent in the human heart as grass on the fields. He looked over a number of books to find a sermon on envy. He could not find one. Sermons on all kinds of subjects, practical, actual or otherwise. But a sermon on envy, not one to be got. Perhaps, then, at the risk of appearing to write a catechetical dissertation rather than an essay proper to a review or magazine, I may be permitted to give a brief and simple explanation of the teach-

ing of our holy mother the Church on this question of the supernatural as interpreted by the most approved authorities.

According to Christian revelation, as taught by the Catholic Church, grace is *not* due to nature at all. God might have created man and the angels, too, in what is called a state of pure nature. We are told that He made both man and the angels in a sanctified state, giving to the latter a degree of grace corresponding to, or suited to, their individual perfection. Thus if one angel were many times more perfect naturally than another angel, God gave to him so many times more grace. To this one grace the angels corresponded or they did not. Those who did obtained immediately their reward. So that the angels preserve their hierarchical order in heaven, according to the common opinion, the same as if they had been created and remained in a purely natural condition. It is a pious belief that the souls of men are sanctified in various degrees so as to fill the gaps left in this blessed hierarchy by the defection of the fallen spirits. To the first man God gave a certain measure of sanctifying or habitual grace as he saw fit. God might have created him with or without grace, as he is now, in what we call his fallen state, subject, that is, to suffering, with evil inclinations, etc. He did not; He created him exempt from all these things, with the additional possession of grace. Now this grace is always accompanied by, if it is not one with, the theological virtue of charity. For grace is a real something, something existing in the soul, created there by God, not due to nature, of an incomprehensibly higher order than the order of nature, entirely different in kind, something which makes man resemble his Maker as He is personally constituted, as by nature he resembles Him in substance or being.

Without grace man would never have suspected or known the existence of the Trinity; he would not have been called to the beatific vision; God would have been his last end, and after his present life, if his soul were pleasing to God, he would enjoy a happiness great indeed, but incomparably below that to which he is now called. He would see God as from outside, as we look at a picture, or as we look at the outside of a palace; whereas, if he dies in the possession of grace, he will be received into the bosom of the blessed Trinity; he will be like the child of the house, who has the whole run of it and from whom nothing is concealed. If Adam had been created without grace, he naturally would have died and then entered into the possession of his natural happiness, if he deserved it. But being once called to a life of grace, he had no longer the choice to be contented with a state of natural perfection or to aim at that which was higher. He was obliged to correspond with grace, and to die, if he died, in a state of grace. For the grace of God was of two kinds,

actual and habitual. Habitual grace was a permanent thing which was infused into Adam's soul at the moment of his creation, and which is now received by infants with their baptism. Actual grace is the help or assistance God gives to the soul in order to enable it to perform actions of the supernatural kind. To man God did not give so much habitual grace and no more. On the contrary, so long as man lives he can increase the sum of his habitual grace, and this he does by corresponding with the actual graces he receives. Every time that man coöperates with the impulse of the Holy Ghost, accomplishes an act of obedience and love for God, the Almighty at the same time increases in a proper proportion the amount of grace in his soul. This is similar to what takes place in the natural order. Habits are strengthened by acts. It is by repeated acts that we become confirmed in our habits both of virtue and of vice. The supernatural virtues grow in the same way, only in this case God must Himself cause the augmentation directly by His creative power in the supernatural order. Of course, God always creates or preserves us in the natural order, too; but in the natural order man's action has something to do with the increase of the habit.

By his sin Adam lost the grace of God. But there is no difference between the grace of Adam before his fall and that which he afterwards received and which we possess through the death and merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church is contradictory to that of all the so-called reformers of the sixteenth century, and infinitely more worthy of our conception of the Deity. But to occupy ourselves in this place with their monstrous imaginings would be to lose our way and our time. The grace of God was amissible both to Adam and to Christians. Grace was given and is offered freely, and just as freely man may accept or reject it. If he rejects it, then he is no friend of God. Nor will he be his friend in the life to come. Heaven was closed to all the sons of Adam when he fell. But Christ died, and heaven was opened again. All men may enter there, because all men may obtain and keep the grace of God. All men are called to do so. Christ died for all, and all men are under an obligation to profit by His death.

Here comes a tremendous question. How can they? How can the Negroes of Central Africa, how can the inhabitants of Thibet know of Christ and profit by His grace? How, indeed, to come nearer home, can the majority of the people living all around us know that the Roman Catholic Church is the true church? To be saved we must believe and be baptized. Sometimes we answer questions by recounting a fact. A story then is told of Hermann, the pianist, who was a converted Jew, and who died in the odor of

sanctity. When he was thinking with grief of the death of his Jewish mother, who would not see or speak to him, our Lord made known to him interiorly that He Himself had appeared to the dying lady, declared that He was the Messiah, and she, like St. Paul, believed and was saved. She obtained the baptism of desire. God can communicate His gifts independently of the visible organization which we call the church. How often does He do so? Always, it seems to me, in this sense, that He always offers His grace, the first grace first. If the soul corresponds to that one, then He offers another. Christ died for all, all are under the obligation to lead a supernatural life. Therefore God must offer them His grace. Theologians tell us there is a moment when every man reaching the age of reason is obliged to choose what is morally right or morally wrong. Why should God not give him the grace to choose supernaturally? St. Thomas says that God would send an angel to instruct a well-meaning man rather than let him die in ignorance and sin. The Lord has many angels. What is to prevent them from suggesting thoughts of repentance even to sinning and guilty men? Who knows what takes place between the soul and its Lord at the hour of death? No one has ever told us that. The chief one of His attributes which God was pleased to reveal in the work of creation is that of mercy. The whole work of creation is a manifestation of mercy. This is true of both the natural and the supernatural creation. In the natural order nothing can be more miserable than nothingness itself. Mercy means goodness to misery. To give existence to that which was not is certainly an act of mercy. To give the life of grace is an additional act of mercy. To restore divine charity to the guilty soul black with sin, that surely is a most wonderful act of mercy. And to be desirous to forgive, and willing to forgive again and again and again, that is mercy indeed. But to take the nature of guilty man, and in that nature to die for him, that all men might be saved—who can call in question the proof that the one object of creation was to show a power of being merciful limited only by the divine omnipotence and wisdom itself? We know that all men need this mercy; and, although we cannot sit in judgment on the Almighty, still, when He chooses some souls and rejects others, we know that it is not without reason and justice. We know that always and at all times and under all circumstances this God of infinite charity and of infinite mercy wishes every soul of men to be saved and wishes it intensely. Our God is a God of love. Our God is not only not a tyrant or a selfish being who acts like a kind of blind fate, but to every child that has been formed by His own hand we believe that He is the tenderest of fathers, more loving than a million mothers. Another thing to be remembered is this: we

know positively all that the Church has made known to us dogmatically from revelation, and we know the conclusions which follow necessarily from such premises; but all this is comparatively little. Outside of that little our ignorance is immense. We are like a man who walks out in the morning in a fog; he sees before, behind, to the right and to the left, a little but enough. When we die the fog will be lifted and the whole glorious horizon shall appear distinctly to our satisfied view.

Nevertheless, every man coming into this world is obliged to enter the Roman Catholic Communion. He cannot take this step, however, till he realizes the obligation so to do, nor could any Catholic priest baptize him until he says that such is his conviction. How long persons remain in good faith before entering the Church, how many of them are in a state of grace, how many die outside the visible fold of the Church really in friendship with God, how many, though they may have sinned grievously, repent and are saved, God knows; we do not. This is the safest way to talk on this subject. God alone sees men's hearts. What we do know is—and this is a ground for almost infinite hope—that He is infinitely good, and has perhaps a thousand secret ways of saving souls of which we possess no knowledge. Our duty is to tell people to revere God and to pray, to be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in us, to preach the Gospel if we are priests, to help our neighbors in every way in our power, especially by good example.

But the natural virtues are very beautiful! Undoubtedly they are, as everything is which God has made—the stars, the mountains, the forests, the fields, the sea. And things which God has made in the intellectual and spiritual order are more beautiful than anything in the merely animal or vegetable or mineral kingdom; the song and flight and plumage of birds, the fragrance and bloom of flowers, the brilliancy of the Aurora Borealis, the cataract of Niagara, what are these to the beauty of moral virtue? This moral virtue is the highest gift of God to man—in the natural order. To be brave, to be generous, to be true, to give and to forgive—that is glorious! To take one instance out of the hundreds we read of every day in our papers of man's fidelity to duty, of our firemen or policemen, of life-savers on the seacoast, of locomotive engineers, of that commonest of kinds of heroism which men will never tire of admiring, of physical courage; take the example of that Japanese soldier—he may have been a Christian, most probably he was a pagan—who, when there was no other way, rushed forward and blew up the Chinese breastwork, blowing himself at the same time into eternity. That man was another Arnold Winkelreid. But the natural virtues are not confined to mere animal courage under the

VOL. XXVI—8.

excitement of the enthusiasm of a moment. All the moral virtues can exist in the natural order. And all these virtues are God's gifts. What has man got which he does not owe to his Creator? And his Creator is ready to help him to gain increase and become perfect in the practice of these virtues, too. Only in practice we find that too often the men who have left us examples of the exercise of these heroic gifts were inconsistent. Read Plutarch's lives of his heroes; you will find that those men who at one time were merciful, at another were cruel; he who in one circumstance proves himself chaste, in another shows himself libidinous; and so on. But ordinary Christians cannot reproach the great men of antiquity very much, for they themselves are often little better. And no wonder; for Christians, too, are generally poor travelers who stumble on the way. Only the saints were consistent men.

These natural virtues possess another great, very practical advantage, for they dispose a man to be more fit to receive the gifts of a higher kind. The absence of vice is not a virtue, the presence of natural virtue is not a proof of grace. But certainly if we remove impurities from the water which we drink it is less liable to be injurious to our health. It is clearly a matter of common sense that a soul rich with these natural virtues is a better field in which for God to plant the seed of His grace than a soul which is choked full with the weeds and thorns of vice. Nevertheless God may show Himself liberal to the sinful soul and apparently withhold His mercy from the more upright men. He may do this because he is free. He may do it for reasons simply inscrutable to us at present. He may do it because He sees things in the heart of the so-called naturally just man which displease Him and finds probabilities in the sinful man which appeal to His designs of mercy. Who can understand His ways and who can call Him to account? What we know is this, that not all the natural virtue which has ever been exhibited is equal to a degree of supernatural grace. The grace received by an infant baptized in danger of death deserves a greater recompense than the merits of all the natural acts of virtue of all mankind from the day of Adam till the day of doom. Without it no man shall see God; with it that child shall rejoice in the happiness of His presence during an eternity of glory. More than this, all the valor, patience, self-control, fidelity, truth, benevolence, spirit of sacrifice that have appeared in the history of all men are not worthy, in the sight of God, to deserve one degree of that grace which was first freely given to Adam, but which is now imparted to the believing soul only in virtue of the merits of the blood of Jesus Christ. The first act of faith is a free gift of God. The first supernatural grace, actual grace, the inspiration to pray, is a thing which cannot be bought

of the Holy Spirit by all the combined efforts of a purely natural kind of all the race of men and all the angels of heaven. So that here is a great gulf fixed.

The institution of the sacraments in the Christian Church may throw some additional light on this matter, especially what are called the sacraments of the dead, baptism, penance, extreme unction. Before the coming of our Lord, to be forgiven their sins men were obliged to make acts of perfect contrition. There was no other possible way of obtaining pardon. Now we are forgiven through the sacraments without perfect contrition. How? By acts of natural sorrow? Not a bit. All the natural sorrow in the world will not deserve forgiveness of sin. A man may go to confession with regret for his misdeeds, from excellent motives, but all in the natural order. He may make a good confession, so far as the mere accusation of his faults goes, imagine he has been pardoned, be in perfect good faith and yet remain guilty before God. This is why Catholic theologians have established the distinction between perfect and imperfect contrition. If perfect contrition were necessary, as it was before the time of Christ, then the sacraments would be useless. Mere natural repentance does not count. Therefore they concluded that there were two sorts of sorrow, both of the supernatural kind, one which deserved at once the remission of sin, the other which was imperfect and incomplete in its kind. This latter, however, as it is supernatural also in its origin and character, so disposes the soul that it may be elevated by additional grace to that perfection of repentance which brings with it the infusion of sanctifying grace and charity. It is this additional grace which is received more easily and expeditiously through the sacraments. Probably before the coming of our Lord no Jewish rabbi would have thought of making this distinction in the ways of loving God and grieving for offense against Him. But its reality helps to enlighten us more on the absolute abyss which extends between the highest energy of mere nature and the lightest influence of grace.

This may explain some things apparently unintelligible or which may scandalize persons of weak mind and especially of weak faith. These natural qualities of honesty, industry, sobriety, etc., which are found in men of every religion and no religion at all, deserve some recompense. That recompense cannot be in the life to come. St. Augustin says the Romans were rewarded with the empire of the world for their natural virtues. Why should not nations, and individuals, too, be recompensed in the same way to-day as well as in past times? An individual may become rich, a family may prosper, a nation may obtain a great empire, and this may be the return made by heaven in this life, for their practice of natural virtue,

to those whom God shall call to account for their neglect of supernatural grace in the next.

Then, however, the natural virtues shine out most resplendently when they have been vivified by a supernatural principle. When the hero who fights for his country at the same time fights for God; when he who, knowing that he leaves a wife and children desolate, throws away his own life to save that of others, does it from a motive of religion as well as a natural sense of duty, ah! then you have the grandest thing in man. When the Indians tore out the heart of Father de Brébœuf, burning at the stake, that they might infuse into themselves something of his courage by drinking his blood, it was because Brébœuf was naturally a brave man. But compare his constancy with that of the savages who tortured him. They, from a motive of pride characteristic of their race, would endure every torment without flinching. The priest bore his sufferings with a quiet dignity as superior to the bravado of the savage as his religion was above that of the manitou and the sorcerer. Great are the natural virtues, good are the natural virtues; but it is because the Creator intended that, in the present disposition of things, they should be elevated to a higher plane, so that by their use the souls of men should not only give greater glory to God on earth, but earn higher crowns for themselves in heaven. By all means let us admire everything that is good in our neighbors and give them credit for it, and let us try to practise ourselves all the moral virtues, only with a supernatural motive.

This article would not be complete without some more direct allusion to the momentous question of the distribution of grace. The scholastic theologians tell us that all questions end in mystery. If there be anything, then, which is a mystery to the human mind, it is this most serious question of the distribution of grace. Why does God give so much to some and so much more to others? If Christ died for all, why are not all saved? It is the same question and the same mystery as the permission of evil. Why does God permit suffering, sin, the loss of souls? Why was Abel innocent and Cain a reprobate? Here we can only bow down our heads and adore, knowing that God is not unjust. He would not force the human will. He permits evil to draw from it greater good. To save the fallen race of Adam, Christ became man. But there was no special incarnation for the race of Cain. On the contrary, God tells us that He will punish the sins of parents on their children to the third and fourth generation, while he will show mercy to thousands of those who love and serve Him. God would not force the human will. With infinite prescience He knows which is the proper and fitting grace to give to every soul. That grace is always sufficient

for salvation, probably superabundantly sufficient. If the soul corresponds with the grace which it receives, that grace becomes efficacious, and if the soul preserves and corresponds to its final grace, it will be saved.

But here comes in another consideration. Do we know that we correspond with the grace of God? Absolutely, with a positive knowledge, no. The grace of God and the whole supernatural order is something insensible and invisible. We cannot be conscious of the presence and the action of grace. The supernatural world is something nature and our natural faculties cannot be cognizant of. We can conclude the presence of grace, however, by its evident effects. By their fruits ye shall know them. A good tree produces good fruit. Those who live up to the norm and standard of Christian ethics we may believe to be actuated by the Christian spirit. But this is only a guess, a probability or what is called broadly a moral certitude. No man knows, the Scripture says, whether he be worthy of love or hate. My conscience reproaches me nothing, says St. Paul, yet not therefore am I justified. God alone sees the heart; we do not know our own. Not that this possibility of doubt should discourage us. In this life, in almost every business, we must act on probabilities, and in the all-important business of our salvation we must act on this moral certitude, this great probability. If we live in doubt and darkness, we know that God is good and wise, merciful and loving. It is well for us that we should be in a state of incertitude in this life; it stirs us to exertion and vigilance and keeps us in God's holy fear and in a salutary humility. More than this, even if we were aware that we were now, this moment, in God's friendship, we know not what the future may bring about. Therefore we can despise no one. We can never say, like the Pharisee, I am righteous and this man a sinner. And even if we did know that we were in God's grace and our neighbor in a state of sin, we know not how it will be to-morrow, and especially when the end comes. We may yet be reprobates, we may have a comparatively low place in heaven, and he whom we now despise may be high up among God's blessed in the celestial hierarchies.

In the light of eternity all God's ways will be made evident and plain. Now and here even an almost infinitely beautiful variety manifests itself in the distribution of his natural gifts, subject to some hidden unity of plan; the day will come when His ways in the spiritual world will be justified before all men, and we shall see that all was well and all was wise and all was done in goodness. Meanwhile we must not allow ourselves to be influenced by the Thomas-like incredulity of those who fear to believe—and fear to hope—because with moles' eyes they cannot

pierce the sun. To be men as well as Christians we must stand by what is certain, no matter how many difficulties present themselves to our exceedingly weak intellect in the explanation of details. God is necessarily, absolutely, infinitely good; He loves all things that He has made, He wishes all men to be saved, and Christ died for all, and the God-man did this with a charity so great that all the angels that could ever possibly be created would not begin even to appreciate it. So we must conclude that, whether men correspond with these designs or not, it is the ardent wish of heaven that all mankind should lead a supernatural life and enjoy in the hereafter a supernatural reward. Therefore if any of us come to grief, not only will it be by our own fault, but in spite of earnest, careful, sincere, to speak humanly, whole-hearted efforts on the part of our Creator to prevent our going astray. Short of forcing the human will, and so far as is consistent with the dictates of his omniscient judgment in the organization of things which he has chosen to establish, He endeavors to make every one lead a supernatural life, kindly and energetically, infusing into men's souls, as the beginning of wisdom, His holy fear, but wishing them to love Him with a love, if possible, as boundless as His own beauty, goodness and immeasurable mercy.

D. A. MERRICK, S. J.

New York, N. Y.

THE MYSTIC RITES OF ELEVSIS.

IN many natural religions there are performed at certain recurrent festivals and on the occasion of portentous events, peculiar clandestine and orgiastic rites which may be witnessed only by members of the clan or brotherhood. Secret ceremonies of this kind were not absent from the old Hellenic religions. Of all mystic sanctuaries to which only properly qualified and duly approved spectators were admitted, the most celebrated in the classic ages and in subsequent history was the shrine of the twain goddesses at Eleusis.¹

Investigators are unable to date the first beginnings of this Attic town of Eleusis. However, the discovery of prehistoric tombs near its ancient citadel indicate that it was well inhabited in the second millenium before Christ. Its advantageous position made it a centre of opulence. It owned the fertile Rharian fields which stretch westward along the sea towards the Megarid, and the equally productive plain of Thria which extends eastward along the road to Athens.

¹ Pausanias Description of Greece, 10, 31, 11; Diodoros Historical Library, 5, 4; 5, 77.

Through Eleusis passed the chief overland route between Attika and the rest of Greece. Its secure harbor made it an acceptable commercial station for the Phœnicians and other roving merchants of the eastern Mediterranean. The waters of its expansive bay teemed with fishes and sea fruit. But more than six hundred years before the beginning of our era the Eleusinians lost their independence and were absorbed in the Athenian Commonwealth. This change, instead of proving detrimental to their local religious practices, rather contributed to their preservation and further development. For the Eleusinian cult was adopted by the victorious Athenians and became part of the State religion.

The divinities in whose commemoration the mystic rites were performed are most popularly known through a fable called "the anthology," which has often been retold by poets and mythologists.² The divine Persephone while romping with the daughters of the ocean in the flowery fields of Nisa is kidnapped by Polydegmon or Plouton, the King of the Dead, and carried off to become his consort and to reign with him forever in his silent halls. Her forlorn mother, Demeter, not knowing what fate had befallen Persephone, travels the earth in search of her. The Sun, who was the only witness to Polydegmon's act, finally revealed the facts. Thereupon Demeter, in her displeasure, wandered off to Eleusis, where she revealed herself to Keleos the King, and caused him to build a temple sacred to her. In this temple she took up her abode, refusing to return to Olympos and to associate with the other gods until after her daughter was restored to her. She sent a destructive drought and blight over the earth, and it ceased to give forth its fruits. The human race was about to perish through famine, and then there would be no men to honor the gods by sacrifice. To avert these impending calamities a reconciliation was effected through the mediation of Zevs. Persephone was to stay for nine months of every year in the company of her mother, and for the remaining three was to reign with her gloomy husband over the inane souls of the departed.

This myth, like the mystic cult based upon it, underwent various changes during the successive ages. How and when it began cannot be ascertained. Perhaps it was brought to Eleusis from Krete, as Gruppe confidently states.³ At least in later times the Kretans are reported as believing that the worship of Demeter had, like other Attic cults, been transplanted from their island into Attika.⁴ Accepting the Kretan provenance of the cult, the ninth century before Christ may be assigned as the epoch during which the Eleusinian

² Homeric Hymn to Demeter; Apollodoros, *Bibliothēke*, 1, 5, 1; Ovid, *Fasti*, 4, 417-618; *Metamorphoses*, 5, 358-408; Claudian, *De raptu Proserpinae*. ³ *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, p. 17. ⁴ Diodoros *Historical Library*, 5, 77; Cf. Hymn to Demeter, 122-123.

sanctuary was established. But if Foucart's reasoning be correct, the cult is still older, and came from Egypt in the epoch of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth dynasty, sixteen or seventeen hundred years before our era.⁵ The earliest literary mention of this sanctuary is in the hymn to Demeter, which was composed towards the close of the seventh century. The hymn shows, however, that the rites were then already venerably ancient. It also refers to their mystic character and to the blissful fate of all mortals to whose lot falls the happiness of being initiated into them. In the most primitive stages of their existence these mysteries were probably religious ceremonies performed at a shrine belonging to a few of the prominent families of Eleusis. Circumstances now unknown added some special virtue or glory to these rites, and the privilege of participating in them was extended to other Eleusinians. In historic times two Eleusinian families, the Eumolpids and the Keryks, possessed the secret of the mysteries by ancient inheritance transmitted from generation to generation. They conducted the mystic rites and presided over all the acts of initiation. It may therefore easily be supposed that those who originally established this cult in Eleusis were the progenitors of the Eumolpids and Keryks.

In the anthologic myth there are survivals of two kinds of primitive cult. Demeter, the corn Lady, and Persephone, the seed which annually remains hidden in the earth for a third of the year, are deities which naturally belong to agrarian rites; while Plouton, as the dark receiver and possessor of the dead, is a divinity closely connected with the worship of ancestors. In their later development the Eleusinian mysteries grew into a series of magnificent ceremonies which bore very slight resemblance to rites of such an origin. But, nevertheless, the emphatic and exceptional way in which these mysteries nourished the hope that after death the human soul survives, recalls these primitive agrarian and funereal practices, and may be explained by thinking that some resemblance was seen between the fate of mortals after death and of the seed which is covered and hidden in the earth, but does not lose its vitality.

The shrine of Demeter and Kore, her daughter, must have been highly revered in the seventh century before Christ. On that account the Athenians, when they annexed Eleusis to their territory, incorporated the rites of these goddesses into the State religion of Athens. This official act occasioned a number of modifications in the Eleusinian cult. Presence at the celebration of the mysteries, and participation in them, was no longer the exclusive privilege of the Eleusinians. Any Athenian citizen, any inhabitant of Attika, might under prescribed conditions be initiated and allowed to enjoy

⁵ *Recherches sur l'origine et la nature des mystères d'Eleusis*, p. 75.

all the blessings that the mysteries could give. For the accommodation of the increased number of participants a larger temple or hall had to be constructed at Eleusis. Mystic rites of this kind could not be performed in the open air, like most other Hellenic religious exercises. The preliminary and preparatory rites and purifications and sacrifices which each candidate had to fulfil before being received into the temple of Demeter and her daughter were hereafter to take place not at Eleusis, but at Athens. And after the completion of these preparatory ceremonies then all who were to see the mysteries went in sacred procession on a fixed day from Athens to Eleusis.

When the armies of Xerxes invaded Greece, in 480 before Christ, they pillaged and burned the sanctuary of Demeter,⁶ where the mystic ceremonies used to be celebrated in Eleusis. But immediately after their departure the sanctuary was restored and the rites were continued. By their wise and patriotic conduct in the struggle against the Persian invaders the Athenians created for themselves the well-merited reputation of being the foremost and most enviable of all the inhabitants of the Greek world. Athens was for the Greeks what Paris once was for the inhabitants of Europe. The Athenians were regarded as models in everything that related to the higher and more cultivated and more spiritual life.⁷ From all quarters of the Hellenic world candidates applied for admission to the Eleusinian rites. The extension of the privilege to all Greeks, whether Athenians or not, must have occurred shortly after the Persian wars, if not even earlier.⁸ Herodotos and Isokrates and others refer to it as to an established practice. And about 440 B. C., so widely recognized were the claims of the Eleusinian sanctuary that the Athenians passed a law regulating the manner in which the annual regular offerings of first fruits were to be delivered. These gifts Athens seems to have confidently expected and received for the sanctuary, not only from her allies, but also from many of the other independent Greek States.⁹

No amount of investigation will ever reconstruct for us a complete picture of what took place at these mysteries. The obligation of secrecy which was imposed on every candidate for admission was never openly violated. Two chief considerations checked all indiscreetness in this direction. Whoever dared to divulge what he saw and heard within the holy walls not only committed an offense against religion and thus exposed himself to the vengeance of the gods, but also made himself a culprit before the laws of the State and liable to punishment by death. Those who knew the mysteries never conversed about them without first assuring themselves that

⁶ Herodotos, 9, 65. ⁷ Cf. Thukydides, 7, 63, lines 12-14, ed. Bœhme, 1884. ⁸ Cf. Herodotos, 8, 65; Isokrates, *Panegyric*, 46, a-c; Libanios, *Korinthiac Oration*, 4, p. 356. ⁹ Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 2d ed., No. 13.

no initiated person was within hearing.¹⁰ In the year 421 the enemies of Alkibiades succeeded in having sentence of death passed against him by accusing him of different crimes, the principal one, and perhaps the only one mentioned in the official indictment, being that with a number of riotous companions he had one night parodied and ridiculed the rites of Eleusis.¹¹

About the year 315 B. C. a young man named Theodoros was sitting and chatting with Evrykleides, the hierophant of the mysteries. Theodoros, wishing to tease his solemn companion, said that every hierophant was guilty of the crime of revealing the mysteries because when accepting postulants and initiating them the hierophant always imparted to them a knowledge of the secrets. Evrykleides, however, refused to regard the mysteries as a suitable topic for pleasantries. He brought an accusation of impiety against the wit-loving philosopher. Theodoros was condemned to die by drinking hemlock, but perhaps the sentence was remitted through the influence of the archon Demetrios of Phaleron.¹² Pausanias, who as an intelligent and curious tourist was disposed to describe in detail the architecture and much of the history of the shrines of the two goddesses in Athens and Eleusis, suddenly cuts off his description with the remark that in a dream he had been directed not to proceed further in this respect.¹³

But notwithstanding this severe reticence regarding everything connected with these hidden rites, it is quite probable that something of what was to be seen and heard within the hall of initiation became known even to the "profane." Early Christian writers, in their attacks on paganism, refer to the mysteries and mention rites and formulas peculiar to them. This fact indicates that these ecclesiastical scholars, although not initiated in the mysteries, were nevertheless acquainted with them, at least partially. And their statements concerning the performances and utterances that constituted part of the mystic services are one of our chief sources of information.

As a welcome supplement to the rare and meagre bits of information scattered throughout the ancient texts come some interesting facts furnished by archæological research. A few antique vases have been found in Italy and Greece which are decorated with scenes illustrative of mystic initiation ceremonies. Scientific excavations made at Eleusis have laid bare the foundations of the ancient hall where the initiations took place, and of the other shrines and edifices belonging in some way or other to the Eleusinian cult. A number of inscriptions found at Eleusis and others found at Athens give precise information concerning many of the outward features of the

¹⁰ Platon, *Theætetos*, 155 e. ¹¹ Thukydides, 6, 28, 53, 60-61; Andokides, *On the Mysteries*, 11; Plutarch, *Life of Alkibiades*, 19, 22. ¹² Diogenes Laertios, *Lives of the Philosophers*, 2, 101. ¹³ Pausanias, 1, 14, 2-3.

celebrations. And pieces of sculpture representing the divinities worshiped in these rites assist in teaching us the nature of the divinities in question and therefore also the nature of the cult by which they were worshiped.

In the fifth century and ever thereafter the postulant went through three sets of ceremonies or three stages of initiation. In the city of Athens he was admitted to what may be called the "first degree;" a few months later he went to Eleusis and entered the first degree of the Eleusinian branch, or the second degree of the full series; and after the lapse of a year he again presented himself at Eleusis for the highest and last degree.¹⁴ The entire process was about as follows:

For several consecutive days in Anthesterion, the vernal month of flowers, the Athenians annually celebrated within the city a festival in honor of Demeter and Kore. The rites performed at this festival were not open to the public and might be witnessed only by accepted and ritually prepared postulants. To distinguish them from the greater celebration at Eleusis these less important ones were known as the "Little" or "Lesser Mysteries."¹⁵ From the name of the locality where the temple stood in which these Little Mysteries took place they were also known as the "Mysteries in Agrae."¹⁶ Strangers who undertook the journey to Athens as postulants for admission were protected from all molestation, even in time of war, by a truce which lasted about fifty-five days.¹⁷ As a preparation for beholding the ceremonies each candidate bathed himself in a way prescribed by ritual in the River Ilisos,¹⁸ and offered certain propitiatory sacrifices. The purificatory rites may have varied according to the needs of the candidates. Those who were guilty of deeds of blood and of other heavy crimes, if they had never been ritualistically purified, were not admitted. This exclusion¹⁹ of unfit candidates and preparation of others by a purification adapted to their condition, presupposes some kind of confession of grave sins. After witnessing the secret rites each candidate was known as an "initiate" or "myst." Concerning the mysteries at Agrae no further and deeper information is available. In later times, in order to accommodate the great numbers of strangers who presented themselves for initiation, these lesser mysteries were sometimes celebrated twice in the same year,²⁰ for no one might enter the Great Mysteries without previously being prepared by acceptance into those at Agrae.²¹

Every autumn, in the month of Boedromion,²² the mystic rites

¹⁴ Ploutarch, *Life of Demetrios*, 26. ¹⁵ Polyaenos, 5, 17; *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, I., p. 4 n. 1 B. ¹⁶ Ploutarch, *Life of Demetrios*, 26; Kleitodemos, in Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, I., 359; Dionysius *Periegetes*, 424; Himerios, in Photios' *Bibliothēke*, 1, 119; Polyaenetus, 5, 17. ¹⁷ C. I. A., 1 p., 4 n., 1 B. ¹⁸ Polyaenos, 5, 17; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5, 689. ¹⁹ Theon Smyrnaeus, 14, 20-25; Celsus, apud Origenem, 253, ed. Koetschau. ²⁰ Inscription in the *Ephemeris Archaeologica*, 1887, p. 177. ²¹ Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5, 204, ed. Sylburg. ²² Ploutarch, *Demetrios*, 26; Phokion, 6; Alexander, 31.

were performed at Eleusis. Every four years they were celebrated with exceptional magnificence²³ and accompanied by agonistic contests. Long before the time appointed for the beginning of the festival messengers sent out from Athens announced the sacred truce to all the neighboring States.²⁴ The celebration lasted about twelve days. The first few days were devoted to preparation. On the 14th of the month certain sacred and precious objects which were needed in Athens for the preparatory days of the festival, and which when not in use were kept carefully hidden in the sanctuary at Eleusis, were carried by priestesses to Athens and deposited in a holy house called the Eleusinion, near the Akropolis. These objects were probably vestments and utensils used in the performing of the sacred rites and also certain objects connected with the worship of Iakchos, whose cult had been associated with that of Demeter and Kore. Perhaps, also, statues representing these divinities were among these sacra. From an inscription²⁵ we learn that in the second century of our era it was customary for a company of young Athenian knights to constitute a mounted guard of honor accompanying these venerable sacra from Eleusis to Athens. The bearers of the sacra were escorted part of the way by the people of Eleusis, and on their approach to the city they were met by the people of Athens, who accompanied them to the Eleusinion with acclamations of pious welcome. As soon as these objects had been placed in the temporary repository in the Eleusinion the phædyntes, or official who had charge of them, announced the fact to the priestess of Athena, the tutelary goddess of the city, and with this announcement the festival began.²⁶

On the following day the mysts who intended to go to Eleusis were convoked into an assembly to hear the warning against all who were guilty of manslaughter or other heinous offenses²⁷ and all who by reason of other prohibitions might not be initiated. Women possessed equally with men the privilege of initiation. Children were received into the Little Mysteries, and possibly also into those of the first night at Eleusis. It seems that slaves of Greek descent were also occasionally allowed to participate.²⁸ This condescension in favor of the slaves is the more remarkable because as a rule slaves were not allowed to associate on equal terms with free citizens in religious rites at Athens.²⁹ Barbarians were strictly excluded.³⁰

Each postulant, in order to be accepted and to receive instruction, placed himself under the guidance of a mystagogue.³¹ The mysta-

²³ Aristotle, *Polity of Athens*, 54; C. I. A., III., 663. ²⁴ Aeschynes, 2, 133; Dittenberger, *Syll. Inscr. Gr.*, 2d ed., 646. ²⁵ C. I. A., III., 1 p. 5 n. 5. ²⁶ C. I. A., III., 5. ²⁷ Polydevkes, 8, 90; Theon of Smyrna, p. 22, ed. Dupuis. ²⁸ C. I. A., II., 834 b; Theophilus, in scholion to Dionysios Thrax, p. 724. ²⁹ Philon, *That every honest man is free*, 20, p. 468 M. ³⁰ Isokrates, *Panegyric*, 73, d-e. ³¹ C. I. A., IV., 1, I. supplement, p. 3 f.

gogue was by descent a member of either the Evmolpid or the Keryk family. Perhaps such postulants as were rejected by the mystagogues might make a final appeal to the hierophant. Or perhaps the hierophant might reject candidates even when introduced and recommended by a mystagogue. In the year 31 of our era the celebrated wonder-worker, Apollonios of Tyana, came to Athens and requested the privilege of initiation; but the hierophant hesitated, saying that the gates of Eleusis were not open to magicians who communed with unclean spirits.³² But Apollonios was later admitted. It may be that occasionally the hierophants were put to their wits' ends to observe the strict law and yet accept candidates who though debarred for some cause or other could not recklessly be turned away. When Demetrios came from Asia and won the temporary gratitude of the Greeks by driving the Makedonians out of the Peloponnesos, he sent a message to the Athenians saying that he was about to arrive in their city and that he desired initiation into all the degrees of the mysteries. The Athenians, unable to expect the hierophants to violate the law which ordained that the first initiation should take place in springtime and the second in autumn and the third in the autumn of the following year, removed all difficulties by means of a wonderful casuistic juggling with the official calendar. They decreed that the month of Demetrios' arrival in Athens should for the nonce be officially known as the spring month Anthesterion, and that after the Prince had received the first initiation in the Little Mysteries, this same month should immediately take on the name of the autumn month Boedromion, and that after the complete initiation was over this polyonymous month should reassume its own proper name.³³

The candidates underwent some fixed kind of probation and preparation. They performed certain purificatory ablutions in the sea³⁴ and offered prescribed propitiatory sacrifices, including that of a sacred pig. Magnificent sacrifices were also offered by the Archon Basileus to bring the favors of the gods upon the Senate, the citizens of Athens, their wives and children. In commemoration of Demeter's nine days' wandering and grief in search of Persephone, the mysts fasted for nine days. Perhaps this fast consisted in eating nothing between sunrise and sunset; perhaps it was merely an abstinence from certain kinds of food, as from meat, fish, beans, pomegranates and apples.³⁵ These various rites and practices all belonged to the first days of the festival and were all performed at Athens.

³² Philostratos, *Life of Apollonios*, 4, 17. ³³ Ploutarch, *Demetrios*, 26. ³⁴ Ploutarch, *Life of Phokion*, 28; Polyænatos, 3, 11. ³⁵ Porphyrios, *De abstin. carn.* 4, 16; *Aelian History of Animals*, 9, 65; Ploutarch, *de solert. anim.* 35, 11; Pausanias, 1, 37, 3; 8, 15, 1.

On the twentieth³⁶ day of the month the mysts went in gorgeous procession from Athens to Eleusis, where the most sacred and secret part of the rites were to be accomplished. They were accompanied by their friends, by the mystagogues, by a military escort of ephebes and by a multitude of men, women and children who took part in the pilgrimage out of piety towards the gods or out of simple curiosity. Thirty thousand may not be an exaggerated number to represent this crowd.³⁷ By consecrated custom the journey was made on foot. This was not a light undertaking, for the Sacred Way which joins Athens and Eleusis measures more than eleven miles. When Athens became opulent and luxurious it began to grow common for richer individuals, especially fashionable ladies and courtesans, to accompany the procession in carriages.³⁸ In order to abolish this growing fashion Lykourgos introduced a law forbidding it and imposing a heavy fine on all who might violate the law. Lykourgos himself was the first to pay the fine, for his wife was the first to offend against the law.³⁹ The mysts wore crowns of myrtle,⁴⁰ for myrtle was sacred to Demeter and Kore as being chthonic deities. In later times they usually dressed in garments of white.⁴¹ Each man carried a torch, which was to be lighted at nightfall.⁴²

In this procession the sacred objects which had been brought to Athens a few days previously were carried back to Eleusis by priests and priestesses and attendants. But the holiest object in the procession was a statue of the young god Iakchos, a sort of agricultural and orgiastic deity, whose worship had been combined with that of Demeter and Kore ever since the cult of Eleusis had become portion of the religion of Athens. According to one myth, he was the son of Persephone. Specially designated officials had charge of the processional car which carried the statue. In a kind of ecstatic frenzy the great multitude kept singing and shouting the name of this god, "Iakch, O Iakchos, Iakch, O Iakchos."⁴³ It seems that the statue was needed in the performance of the secret rites. No other reason explains why it should thus be brought to Eleusis.

Along the Sacred Way there were holy places, shrines, altars and temples at which the pilgrims stopped and performed acts of worship.⁴⁴ These delays so retarded their advance that night came on three or four hours before they reached Eleusis. Their last station was at Krokon's Castle, a village near the ancient confines of Athenian and Eleusinian territory. Here the descendants of the mythic hero Krokon, who inhabited this village, distributed saffron-colored

³⁶ Plutarch, *Life of Camillus*, 19; of Phokion, 28; Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 324. ³⁷ Herodotos, 8, 65. ³⁸ Aristophanes, *Plutos*, 1013-1015; Demosthenes, *Against Meidias*, 158. ³⁹ Pseudo-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators*, 7, 14-15. ⁴⁰ Scholion to Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 330. ⁴¹ C. I. A., III., 1,132. ⁴² Himerios, *Oration*, 7, 2, ed. Dübner. ⁴³ Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 316. ⁴⁴ Plutarch, *Life of Alkibiades*, 34.

ribbons, and each myst tied one of these round his right arm and another round his left leg.⁴⁶ Shortly after this ceremony night came on, and the thirty thousand lighted their immense torches.⁴⁶ They entered Eleusis towards midnight. After feasting and dancing and singing for some two or three hours longer each one found some corner in which to rest as well as he could from his fatigue and regain strength for the great rites which were to begin on the evening of the coming day.

On the following night all who had a right to be received into the first mysteries at Eleusis, or the second degree in the entire mystic series, gathered into the great Telesterion, or Temple of the Twain Goddesses. Modern excavations and investigations at Eleusis prove that at least three times this temple had been rebuilt, and each time on a larger scale. The newest of the three was built in the fourth century and could accommodate about three thousand sitters, being about one hundred and seventy feet square. If one-tenth of those who came to Eleusis in the procession were postulants, then this Telesterion could contain them all at one sitting. Certain preliminary ceremonies took place outside of the Telesterion,⁴⁷ but within a great enclosure shut off from the eyes of the "profane." Here probably the warning against all uninitiated was repeated.⁴⁸ We do not know what precautions were taken to be certain that no uninitiated intruders entered the Telesterion. Only one instance is known when outsiders succeeded in passing within this mystic Temple. They were two young countrymen from Akarnania. They were put to death.⁴⁹ After ascertaining that none save mysts were present the obligation of secrecy was enjoined.⁵⁰ They then passed into the Mystic Temple.

Within this hall the mysts were made to experience the most blood-curdling sensations of horror and the most enthusiastic ecstasy of joy.⁵¹ No lamps were burning to illuminate the hall. The weak light that dimly entered through the openings in the roof was on these moonless nights insufficient to allow the mysts to locate themselves in the spacious room or to recognize each other. They became a frightened crowd.⁵² The interminable suspense of the awe-stricken and groping mysts was at intervals relieved and prevented from turning into madness by occasional mystic phrases uttered by some unseen priest reminding them that their gropings were commemorative of the wanderings of Demeter in search of her lost daughter, and that these horrors would therefore finally turn to some

⁴⁶ Stephanos Byzantios, s. v. "krokoo;" Bekker, *Anecdota*, p. 273. ⁴⁶ Scholion to Sophokles, *Œdipous at Kolonos*, 1048. ⁴⁷ Themistios, *Oration* 5, 71 a. ⁴⁸ Loukian, *Alexander*, 38. ⁴⁹ Livy, 31, 14. ⁵⁰ Sopatros, in Walz ed. of *Greek Rhetors*, 8, 118; Clement of Alexandria, *Protreptika*, 1, 10. ⁵¹ Aristeides, *Eleusinian Oration*, p. 256. ⁵² Cf. Ploutarch, *On the Soul*, 2, 5, ed. Dübner.

mysterious delight. It is probable that in later times tableaux were shown in the dim light, representing scenes in the Under World.⁵³ In the midst of this oppressive darkness a voice cries out in joy. Demeter is represented as having found her daughter. Brazen gongs resound.⁵⁴ The doors of a sanctuary filled with dazzling light⁵⁵ are swept open. The dazed mysts behold resplendent images of the gods, gorgeous priests, glorious scenes. The second and ecstatic act of the drama has begun.

The secret rites seem to have been really the enacting of a great and thrilling drama, in which the mysts, though not the chief actors, were nevertheless not entirely passive. The scenes enacted were taken from the local Eleusinian myth as it had been preserved by tradition in the sacred families of the Evmolpids and Keryks regarding Demeter's grief for her lost daughter and her joy when Persephone was restored to her.⁵⁶ The myth as employed in the Mysteries was supposed to differ from the common legend in many details and to be fully known only to the initiated, and to reveal it would be sacrilegious.⁵⁷ But, nevertheless, since nearly all Athenians were initiated, the secret myth thus became a common piece of knowledge, and some of its details have entered into literature. It was chiefly a drama of action and of wondrous sights, interrupted now and then by the chanting of legends, or when the actors of the drama occasionally enunciated mystic and symbolic formulas. This prevailing silence increased the mysterious and impressive nature of the rites.

Of the officials who presented the mystic drama, the principal ones were the hierophant, the torch-bearer, the altar priest and the holy herald. In a certain portion of the drama the hierophant represented the Demiourg or Creator of the universe, the torch-bearer acted the part of the light-giving Sun, the altar priest represented the moon and the herald impersonated the messenger god Hermes.⁵⁸ The hierophant was the most important personage, the grand master. He was appointed from among the Evmolpids and held the position for life.⁵⁹ When ordained to this office he renounced his individual name and became hieronymous, being usually known and spoken of simply as "the hierophant."⁶⁰ It would seem that he lived a life of strict chastity.⁶¹ For the performance of the duties of his office it was regarded as necessary that he possess a good voice.⁶² This

⁵³ Ploutarch, *On the Soul*, in Stobaeos' *Florilegium*, 120, 28, iv., p. 107, 27ff.; Loukian, *Kataplous*, 22. ⁵⁴ Scholion to Theokritos, *Eidyll* 2, 36; Apollodoro, fragm. 36 in *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* ed. Didot, 1, 434. ⁵⁵ Cf. Dion Chrysostom, *Oration* 12, p. 387, ed. Reiske. ⁵⁶ Gregory Nazianzene, *Oration* 39, 4; Clement of Alexandria, *Protreptika*, 4, 27, ed. Migne. ⁵⁷ Isokrates, *Panegyric*, 28. ⁵⁸ Evsebios, *Preparation for the Gospel*, 3, 12. ⁵⁹ Pausanias, 2, 14, 1; *Ephemeris Archaeologike*, 1883, p. 81, 8; 1895, p. 119. ⁶⁰ Loukian, *Lexiphanes*, 10; Evnapios, *Life of Maximus*, 475, ed. Dübner. ⁶¹ St. Jerome, *Epist.* 123, 905; Arrian *Epiktetos' dissertations*, 3, 21. ⁶² Philostratos, *Lives of the Sophists*, 2, 20.

requisite quality probably refers to the masterly manner in which he was expected to sing his parts in the mystic drama.

When the doors of the sanctuary were swung open and the blazing light streamed out upon the initiated a feeling of blissful consolation took possession of the assembled multitude. Before the eyes of the spectators the hierophant and other sacred persons robed in glittering vestments continued performing mystic rites. According to the Eleusinian version of the wanderings of Demeter, when the goddess arrived in the house of Keleos, the King of Eleusis, she refused all offers of refreshing nourishment until finally, recalled from her moody sadness and made to smile by the humorous remarks of the maid Iambe, she ordered that a beverage be prepared for her from meal and water.⁶³ In commemoration of this mixture which the goddess drank the mysts after their fatiguing gropings in darkness received and tasted of a similar beverage called the "kykeon."⁶⁴ They also seem to have partaken of some kind of food.

After these holier ceremonies were over, and the mysts had seen and venerated and even touched such of the sacred objects as were to be shown to the initiates of the first night, proceedings of a less decorous nature seem to have followed. These were exhibitions and words which served to recall the pleasantries of Iambe⁶⁵ in the presence of Demeter. In other forms of the legend the girl who caused Demeter to smile was called Bavbo. And the fragmentary information which has been preserved concerning Bavbo is of such a nature that it tends to justify the attacks of the early Christian writers who often accused the pagans of having immoral rites in their mysteries.⁶⁶ Still it is probable that the impersonation of Bavbo in the mysteries was rather coarsely humoristic than really immoral.

From the sketch just given some notion may be formed regarding the proceedings that took place on the night when the first set of Eleusinian mysteries was enacted and made known to the initiated. On the following night a second series of similar revelations were shown. But to these none were admitted save such as had received the lower initiation a year before.⁶⁷ The mysts who witnessed these higher mysteries received the title of "epopts." Since the name merely means "beholders," it indicates that in these as in the mysteries of the preceding night the rites consisted more in acts than in words. The greatest event of this night was the "showing of the sacra," an act from which the hierophant received his title. In this ceremony the doors of the anaktoron or penetralia were opened.

⁶³ Hymn to Demeter, 200-211. ⁶⁴ Clement of Alexandria, *Protreptika*, p. 18, ed. Potter. ⁶⁵ Apollodoros, *Bibliothēke*, I, 5, 1-3; Nikandros, *Alexipharmikon*, 128-132, and scholion thereto; Proklos, *Chrestomatheia*, apud Photium, *Bibliothēke*, 319; *Etymologicum Magnum*, s. v. "Iambe." ⁶⁶ Clement of Alexandria, *Protreptika*, 2, 77 f; Arnobius, *adversus Gentes*, 5, 28. ⁶⁷ Plutarch, *Life of Demetrios*, 28.

No one might enter here save the hierophant alone.⁶⁸ He stood at a holy table, upon and near which were the mysterious and much revered sacra. These the hierophant exposed one by one and held up to the worshipping gaze of the beholders. Decorations, drapery, illumination, incense increased the illusion and added to the magnificence. The epopts rivetted their eyes on the holy objects in awe and silence approaching to fear.⁶⁹ We do not know with certainty what these sacra were, but it seems probable that they were statues of the gods and sacred relics of different kinds. They must have included those sacred objects which had a few days before been carried with such pomp to Athens and then back to Eleusis in the Iakchos procession.

Perhaps it is in this part of the initiation that the notorious hierogamic scene took place, in which the marriage of Plouton and Persephone and the birth of Iakchos was represented.⁷⁰ The hierophant and the priestess of Demeter, acting the parts of Plouton and Persephone, descended into a dark retreat to represent the manner in which Persephone had been carried off to the kingdom of the god of the Under World.⁷¹ On returning to the sanctuary the hierophant proclaimed that "the great lady Brimo has brought forth the divine Brimos,"⁷² probably announcing by this formula the mystic birth of Ikachos, the son of Plouton and Persephone. Probably they carried up from the hidden retreat an image of the young Iakchos and placed it in a cradle which as one of the "sacred objects" was waiting to receive him.

Like the details concerning Bavbo, this gamic scene and another scene, from which nothing has been preserved except the words "Hye Kye," that is, "descend in rain, O Zevs, and generate,"⁷³ and another detail representing perhaps the birth of an Eleusinian hero called Evboulevs,⁷⁴ have been attacked as indecorous. All that can be said in extenuation of the evident strangeness of these details is that they appealed to the ancient Greeks in a way absolutely different from the manner in which they would affect people of to-day imbued with more careful principles of morality. The attacks of the ecclesiastical writers were certainly justifiable.

In commemoration of the fact that it was Demeter who first taught the inhabitants of Eleusis how to sow grain and to prepare food from it, heads of wheat were distributed to the epopts, who received them in silence and reverence. This was regarded as one of the most en-

⁶⁸ Aelian, *Fragm.* 12, ed. Didot. ⁶⁹ Ploutarch, *De Profect. Virt. sent.*, p. 258. ⁷⁰ Scholion to Platon's *Gorgias*, 497 c. ⁷¹ Tertullian *ad Gentes*, 2, 7; Asterios, *Encomium of the Martyrs*, 113 b.; Cf. also Origen, *Philosophoumena*, V. 1, 171; Servus *ad Vergilii Aeneid.* 6, 661; Scholion to *Perseus*, *Satire* 5, 145; St. Jerome *adv. Jovin.* 1, 49. ⁷² Hippolytos, *Refutatio Heres.* 5, 8; Origen, *Philosophoumena*, V. 1, 171. ⁷³ Origen, *Philosophoumena*, V. 1, 171. ⁷⁴ Scholion to *Aristeides*, 22; Orphic Hymn, 41, 5-9.

nobling events of the mystic rites.⁷⁵ And with this ceremony the epoptic initiation ended.

It is quite clear from abundant literary testimony that the general final effect of initiation in the mysteries was elevating and consoling. The principal convictions which the initiated carried away with them seem to have been that in the continued existence of the soul after death the initiated would have a happier lot than the darkness and punishments which awaited the "profane." From the first beginnings of Greek literary history down to the last days of pagan Hellenism high-flighted poets, thoughtful philosophers and careful historians agree in sounding the praises of the graces bestowed by these mysteries.⁷⁶ But the lesson taught at Eleusis seems to have been one of enthusiastic emotions and impressive suggestions rather than of intellectual conviction. No well defined and formulated doctrines were taught, except in later times, when neo-Platonic philosophy held the ascendancy in Athens, and some of its precepts were perhaps incorporated into the Eleusinian cult; for in those later days there were hierophants who had become members of this philosophical school. Initiation into the mysteries imposed no obligation of thereafter leading a better life. According to the opinion of the initiate, they would enjoy happiness after death not as a reward for any good or noble acts while on earth, but purely as a grace proceeding from the mysteries.

In his famous painting on the walls of the Lesche in Delphi, representing the Under World, the artist Polygnotos represented some women as condemned to keep forever trying to fill bottomless tubs with water, because they had while on earth neglected to be initiated.⁷⁷ The cynic philosopher Diogenes turned his sarcasm against the Eleusinian rites because pickpockets and rentgatherers if initiated would have a happier future than Epameinondas, who had not provided himself with the favor of the mysteries.⁷⁸ Philo the Jew objected to them on the same grounds.⁷⁹ But the cynic scoffer and the Hebrew follower of Platon did not represent the common Hellenic feeling in regard to Eleusis, as is evident from the multitudes who crowded thither for initiation every year for more than ten centuries, and which even in the last days of Hellenic paganism "was a bond of union in the human race."⁸⁰ For few indeed are those who viewed the question of secret doings with the philosophic independence of Demonax, who would not be initiated because he thought

⁷⁵ Clement of Alexandria, *Philosophoumena*, V. 1, 115. ⁷⁶ Hymn to Demeter, 480-483; Pindar, Fragment 114, ed. Bergk; Sophokles, Fragment 348, ed. Didot; Platon, *Phaedon*, 13 and 29; Gorgias, 47; Republic, 2, 6; Axiochos, p. 196; Isokrates, *Panegyric*, 28; *Panathenais*, p. 185, ed. Jebb; Diodoros of Sicily, 5, 49, 6; Cicero, *Laws*, 2, 14; Inscription from third century A. D. in *Ephemeris Archaeologica*, 1883, p. 81. ⁷⁷ Pausanias, 10, 31, 11. ⁷⁸ Ploutarch, *Morals*, 22 a; Diogenes Laertios, 6, 39; Julian, *Oration* 7, 238. ⁷⁹ *De Vict. offer.* 12, p. 261 M. ⁸⁰ Zosimos, 4, 3.

that whatever was good ought to be promulgated broadcast, and what was bad ought to be exposed.⁸¹

After the initiation ceremonies were over the plemochaoan rites were performed. These seem to have been libations in memory of the dead.⁸² Then all prepared to return to Athens, unless, as was the case on fixed years, if not annually, they prolonged their stay for two or three days in order to celebrate a series of athletic and stadiac games.⁸³ Properly enough, the prizes offered in the contests celebrated here in the territory sacred to the corn goddess Demeter were measures of barley, reaped perhaps in the sacred Rarian plain.⁸⁴

The return to Athens took place in the form of procession, for the god Iakchos had to be escorted back to his sanctuary with becoming pomp. A short distance outside the city of Athens there was a bridge over the Kephisos river, which in the classic days of antiquity was as famous as was the statue of the Pasquino in the days of the Humanists in Rome. The returning mysts and epopts were encountered here by an immense crowd of sportive Athenians, and assailed by all kinds of raillery, jibes and quolibets.⁸⁵ The initiated vigorously answered this shower of ribald darts by retorting in kind. Many in the crowd wore masks. Noted public men and their acts were open to the scorplings and criticisms of wit. Coarse vulgarisms could not have been absent.⁸⁶ After the battle of "gephyrisms" was over, all proceeded on to the city, where the statue of Iakchos was replaced in the sanctuary, and the rites of Eleusis were finished for that year.

Even after Greece lost her independence and became a Roman province the mysteries continued to flourish. The Romans had accepted Hellenic culture, and were therefore not to be excluded from Eleusis, and great numbers of them took the trouble of being initiated, including several of the emperors.⁸⁷ But the sun of paganism began to lose its splendor. Julian, in his attempt to recall the disappearing forms of the past, tried to arouse new enthusiasm for the mysteries. In the year 364 the Christian Emperor Valentinian issued an edict forbidding all nocturnal heathen celebrations, but, yielding to the prayers of the pro-Consul of Achaia, made an exception in favor of the cult of Demeter at Eleusis.⁸⁸ But the doomed end was near, for the Great Master of higher mysteries, the Nazarene, had conquered. The house of the Evmolpids, which for a thousand years had controlled the Eleusiniac cult and from which the hierophant was always to be chosen, perished heirless. Towards

⁸¹ Loukian, *Life of Demonax*, 11. ⁸² Athenaeos, 11, p. 496. ⁸³ C. I. A., II., 341, 402, 444, etc.; Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.*, II., p. 189, 282; *Marmor Parium*, 30. ⁸⁴ Scholion to Pindar, *Olympic Ode*, 9, 150. ⁸⁵ Hesychios, s. v. "gephyrismos;" Scholion to Aristophanes *Acharnians*, 708. ⁸⁶ Cf. Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 409-412. ⁸⁷ E. g., Hadrian; Cf. *Spart. Hadr.*, 13, 1; *Evsebios, Chronicles*, 2, p. 166, ed. Schöne. ⁸⁸ *Zosimos*, 4, 3, p. 176.

the middle of the fourth century the hierophant who initiated the rhetorician Maximus and his biographer Evnapios was indeed an Evmolpid, but he was the last of his line.⁸⁰ In the year 394 the Emperor Theodosios the Second ordered the temple at Eleusis to be closed. But, taking advantage of some favorable opportunity, the wrecked but stubborn adherers to the old cult called a Mithras priest from Thespieae and set him up as hierophant in the temple of Demeter.⁸⁰ But the usurper's exaltation was brief. In the year 395 Alaric and his army of Visigoths came to Eleusis and completely pillaged it.⁸¹ Earthquakes and all-destroying time and the hands of man have continued the work of desolation. And now Eleusis is merely a hillside overlooked by a mediæval Frankish tower and covered with intricate heaps of ruins which the natives used to carry off as building material for their huts, and where English dilettanti and French savants and Greek archæologists have loved to make researches, and among which the daughters of Illyrian invaders, who dwell near by, step their dances to Albanian music on the feast days of their patron saints.

DANIEL QUINN.

Athens, Greece.

CARDINAL MERMILLOD.

I know not when God will call me to Himself; if it be in Rome, I pray of the R. R. F. F. Carthusians to give me the hospitality of the tomb within their vault at the Campo Verano, should this be not inconvenient to them. If I die near Geneva, I desire to be laid within the vaults of Monthoux, or beside my parents, beneath a plain stone slab bearing the inscription of what I have been, with these words added,

Dilecti Ecclesiam.

“**H**E loved the Church!” It was, in truth, the very sum and substance of his life who, prince of the Church and confessor of the faith, far-famed preacher and idol of the multitude, champion of the workingmen and beloved of his Pontiffing, was yet constrained to ask “the hospitality of the tomb” of a humble monastery far removed from the dear land of his birth, while the grand and gracious edifice built by the fruits of his own toil and eloquence within his native city stood empty and desolate and desecrated by the presence of an ignoble schism.

Those of our readers who remember a former paper in this *Review* on “The Restoration of Catholicity in Geneva” may easily recall how, after the great apostasy under Calvin, Geneva had become so

⁸⁰ Evnapios, *Life of Maximus*, p. 52, ed. Boissonnade. ⁸⁰ Evnapios, *Maximus*, p. 52. ⁸¹ Evnapios, p. 53.

Protestant a city that not only the presence of a priest and the saying of Mass, but even the sale of a cross, a crucifix, a rosary or a Catholic book was forbidden by law within the precincts of the town; and how, later on, for a hundred years or more the chapel of the French Embassy (opened in spite of vehement opposition on the part of the Genevan government) was the sole spot within the town or canton where Mass was allowed to be said.

During the French Revolution Geneva was approached in missionary spirit by many an apostle from the neighboring Catholic cantons and provinces, and became a refuge for numbers of exiled Savoyard priests, who, like the *émigré* ecclesiastics in England, doubtless brought a blessing with them. When persecution was relaxed, with Napoleon's Consulate, the vicars general of Lausanne, who administered Geneva under its absent titular Bishop, essayed to establish a permanent mission there, and at the instance of Catholic France the Grand Council made reluctant cession of an old Catholic church, St. Germain, to the French and other Catholics of the town under their first curé, M. Lacoste. It was only at this time, in 1801, that the titular see of Geneva was finally suppressed, or, rather, merged in that of Chambery, on the publication of the famous Concordat which involved the remodeling of the whole ecclesiastical administration of France. Up to this date the lineal succession of Bishops of Geneva had been faithfully kept up, the holders of this empty title residing for the most part at Annecy, and from there administering the affairs of their diocese. Mgr. Paget, the last of these prelates and a most saintly man, was forced, on the French invasion of Savoy, to retire to Turin, whence he watched over his diocese as best he could and provided a refuge for such of his flock as desired to avail themselves of it, sending from thence in 1795 a touching pastoral, said to recall in its language and spirit that of early Christian times, in which he divided his diocese into twenty-four districts, to be visited in due order by missionaries and lay helpers as occasion served.

When the Church of St. Germain was handed over to the Catholics, in 1803, under the pastoral protection of the Archbishop of Chambery, now their Bishop, the former chief pastor, Mgr. Paget, happened to be staying in Geneva, paying a farewell visit to his little flock, and it was he who, a few days after its restoration to Catholic worship, formally blessed and said Mass therein, his last episcopal act ere retiring to his native town, St. Julien, to die.

Thus the old order of things was linked to the new, and the Church of St. Germain, under its energetic and saintly curé, M. Vuarin, became a very living centre of Genevan Catholicity. At his death, in 1843, Geneva held within its walls some seven thousand Catholics,

schools taught by Christian Brothers and by the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, a Catholic hospital and orphanage and other flourishing good works.

It was during the halcyon period of M. Vuarin's long and fruitful pastorate that, on the feast of St. Maurice, Switzerland's chief patron saint, Gaspard, the first child of Jacques Mermillod, a baker of Carouge, and of Pernette, his wife, first saw the light, September 22, 1824. Carouge is a small and quiet suburb of the town of Geneva, and few must have been the Catholic families who gathered there in the bare and humble village chapel, not many years erected probably, for their use. To its font was brought a frail and tiny babe, whose passionately loving mother could scarce keep breath of life in him with all her untiring devotion and still more tireless prayers, little dreaming of the day when he should return to her wrapped in the purple robe of the episcopate.

The boy grew and thrived, always a delicate, precocious, lively and sensitive child, as he began his early studies at the local day school, played with his companions at saying Mass or preaching (principally the latter) and in soberer earnest took part in that service of the altar which has so often proved precursor to the priesthood. His curé noticed the boy's interest in sacred things, his devout attendance at the altar, and urged his parents to let him study Latin, admitting him, too, at an earlier age than was customary to make his first Communion. On entering his fourteenth year he left the paternal roof to become a student at the "mixed" college in Geneva, where he headed the small group of Catholic boys he found there and formed them into a kind of confraternity for converting their Protestant comrades! But he was no sanctimonious or solemn youth, this slender, excitable boy, in spite of his premature propagandism, his childish imitations of priestly functions and his very genuine love of the poor, which sometimes led him even to the questionable lengths of appropriating his father's loaves for their benefit, an act of charity one is sure must have been less condemned than applauded, if not by the sturdy baker himself, at least by his gentle and pious mother, who is said to have been singularly refined both in mind and person, "a born lady," as the saying goes; on the contrary, young Gaspard immortalized his story at one college after another by acquiring a reputation for perpetual high spirits and a great love of boyish pranks and practical jokes of all kinds, of which various instances are still remembered by his comrades.

In 1837 he passed on to more definite theological studies at the Petit Séminaire of St. Louis du Pont, near Chambéry, and having finished his "rhetoric" there, went for "philosophy" to the severer Jesuit College at Fribourg. The letters which his affectionate

family received from him at this period breathe a spirit of joyous contentment which told well for his love of learning.

"I would not exchange my little study and my books for all the gold in the world," he writes. "The hours pass quickly, and I am plunged in work up to the eyes: from five in the morning until eight at night all my moments are counted. I have eight professors! So you may judge whether I have leisure to count the flies, or rather to see the snow, for winter is here."

It was the custom in this, as in most seminaries—we say "was," for unhappily since those days the Jesuits have been expelled from Fribourg—for each priestly aspirant to preach a trial sermon before professors and fellow-students, prepared and written out beforehand. Young Mermillod, however, having at the duly appointed time written and committed to memory the *first* part of his discourse, declared, to the consternation of his hearers, that he would deliver the second part extempore and *unprepared*. The little audience settled to listen in some anxiety, but when, after the gracefully rounded and studied periods of the first part, young Mermillod burst forth into a sudden torrent of eloquence, they felt that one of those orators who are "born, not made," stood among them. A later incident, recorded in the unpublished notes on his life, now in the possession of his family, exhibits, under another phase, the dawning of that gracious gift which was to hold thousands spellbound in later years, as well as possessing a peculiar interest for all lovers of that devotion which is our most precious consolation in these evil and lukewarm times. It seems that the chaplain of the convent school of the Sacré Cœur at Montet had engaged a Jesuit preacher for the "Fête du Sacré Cœur" on the 11th of June, 1847. Almost at the last moment he was prevented from fulfilling his engagement, and the chaplain hurriedly sent to Fribourg for a substitute. No other preacher being apparently obtainable, the good fathers sent off young Mermillod, then only a deacon of twenty-two.

Now, on the vigil of the feast day all the girls who were about to receive Holy Communion were talking together about the coming festival, and they agreed among themselves, "were inspired," as the story goes, to unite in earnest prayer, offering their communions of the next morning and other pious acts and sacrifices for the special intention "that God would send to them an apostle of the Sacred Heart." Next day, after their communion, the girls began to describe one to another the "apostle" for whom they had been asking. He was to be eloquent, of course, devoted to the Holy Father, a faithful and devout son of the Church, very zealous against heresy, and then, they all agreed, he was to have "*l'auréole de la souffrance et de la persécution*." What secret promptings of the Divine Heart

may have given birth to this strange girlish wish, who can tell? But that evening, after Vespers, a young, unknown preacher, a mere boy they must have deemed him, mounted, with evident nervousness, the pulpit steps and began a timidly spoken discourse on the subject of the day—the words of our Lord to Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque. Gradually the youthful speaker seemed to gain courage as he told his hearers that he was not even yet a priest and was preaching that day for the first time; and presently, in an impassioned burst of fervor, he exclaimed: “Seigneur, je m’engage a consacrer ma vie a procurer la gloire de Votre Cœur adorable. J’en fais le serment, *je serai l’apôtre du Sacré Cœur!*”

Years afterwards Monseigneur Mermillod, preaching in another convent of the same order, referred to this incident with the following remark: “Your companions’ prayers were heard even beyond their aspirations, since Pius IX., when consecrating me Bishop, at the time of the beatification of the Venerable Marguerite M. Alacoque, bestowed on me the title of *évêque du Sacré Cœur.*”

The youthful preacher had received the sub-diaconate about two years before the votive incident at the hands of his friend and master, Mgr. Rondu, before the tomb of the great Apostle of Savoy at Annecy, and some days after this impassioned consecration of himself to a like apostolate he received, from his own Bishop, Mgr. Marilley, the further dignity of the priesthood, “with dispensation of age,” on the 24th of June, 1847. His first Mass was said in Geneva on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, and though we hear nothing of those who assisted at it, one is sure that the devoted mother and proud father and all their little family circle would not have failed to be of its congregation. The young abbé was at once appointed Vicaire of Geneva under M. Marilley’s successor, M. Dunoyer, and found himself immediately plunged, not only into parochial, but into controversial work.

For the disastrous civil war called the War of the Sonderbund, which resulted in the expulsion of the Jesuits, the Redemptorists and other religious orders from Fribourg and the rest of the Catholic cantons, was about to open, and after a short but fierce struggle the Catholic army, overpowered by numbers, was forced to capitulate. Convents were suppressed, seminaries closed, priests harassed and persecuted and their venerable chief, the Bishop of Fribourg, was first imprisoned in the historic Castle of Chillon and then exiled.

Probably the ever keen antagonism of the Genevan world to Catholicity in any shape or form was accentuated, if possible, by the consciousness of that struggle beyond. The young curate found ample scope for his controversial tastes and love of fighting in polemical writings and the founding of a religious paper treating of the ques-

tions of the day, *L'Observateur de Genève*, as well as two later periodicals, the *Annales Catholiques de Genève* and the *Correspondence de Genève*.

But an event was now to occur which would carry his name and fame far beyond the boundaries of his native country. Towards the end of 1850 the Genevan Council, priding itself in possession of certain portions of territory where the ancient ramparts of the city had formerly been and were now demolished, presented these lands as building sites to various public bodies, and amongst others a portion was allotted to the Catholics, on which to build a church, that of St. Germain being far too small to contain half their number. It had been the dream of M. Vuarin's life, and now his successor was to carry it out. But though the site was there, the money to build was lacking, and so, remembering the large handed generosity of Catholic France, the Curé of Geneva set out on a begging tour therein, accompanied by his young vicaire.

Their first halt was in Paris, where they met with an encouraging reception, and it so happened that one evening the two Genevese priests were in the reception room of Mgr. Sibour, then Archbishop of Paris, when the venerable Curé of Notre Dame des Victoires and saintly founder of its renowned confraternity, M. Desgenettes, came to lay before his chief an unexpected difficulty which had just befallen him. The Lenten preacher chosen for that office in his church had been suddenly prevented from fulfilling his undertaking; the time was at hand, and M. Desgenettes could find no fitting substitute. Of course, in a church at once so popular and so fashionable, no mediocre preacher would pass muster, and Mgr. Sibour stood reflective for a moment reviewing the situation. Then, with a sudden flash of inspiration, he turned to M. Desgenettes. "Do not distress yourself, M. le Curé," he said; "here is the man who can help you in your need!" And he presented, by a gesture, the young priest by his side, who, almost speechless with surprise, stammered a humble disclaimer as the worthy curé of Notre Dame turned to proffer a formal request for his services. "Do not be afraid," urged the saintly priest gently, "the Blessed Virgin will assist you!" After much hesitation he yielded to the persuasion of his superiors, and finally that time-honored shrine, with its miraculous statue, its ex-voto hung walls, its air heavy with a million prayers, a thousand heartfelt thanksgivings, saw our youthful *debutant* entering his public career in the pulpit of Notre Dame des Victoires.

"From that time," writes one of his biographers, "there was no more peace or repose for the Abbé Mermillod;" his fate was decided; he was to be a popular preacher. Possessing to an exceptional extent the three great qualities of a preacher, clearness of thought,

ready command of language and above all that indescribable "unction" which appeals to heart and brain alike with its subtle, intangible charm, its burning words, its inner and consuming fire, Gaspard Mermillod found himself, from the hour of his first success, launched on one unending round of sermons, Lents, missions and retreats. Paris called him again and again to her pulpits, side by side with Lacordaire and Ravignan and all the great names of the day. Turin saw him preaching before Victor Emmanuel and his Piedmontese Court in 1852; Marseilles, Rouen, Toulouse, Dijon, Bordeaux, all the great cities of France welcomed him north and south, till, like another great contemporary preacher, Father Hermann, the Carmelite, he might have answered when questioned as to his place of residence: "Madame, I live . . . on the train!" Soon he was called on to give ecclesiastical retreats, a branch of priestly labor which soon became one of his specialties, and when, on account of a delicate throat, he was ordered to winter in Rome, Cardinals, Ambassadors and a host of other distinguished personages swelled the ranks of his auditors and admirers.

Meanwhile the walls of a graceful Gothic building, "the most correct and most finished work of our century," were slowly rising, paid for by the results of his eloquence, on the site of the wall originally raised by the King of Prussia to defend Protestant Geneva against Catholic Savoy!

The church was completed in 1857 and consecrated ceremonially on Rosary Sunday, in the presence of a brilliant congregation, Queen Christina of Spain, the Duc and Duchesse de Montpensier, the Abbot of the great African monastery at Staöñch, Dom François Régis, and some four thousand others, representing the Catholic world in various countries, even as the building itself, raised by the alms and subscriptions of all nations, represented and belonged to all. The Abbé Mermillod preached the opening sermon, and it was a strange and a striking one, having as its title the words, "Notre Dame is an act of liberty and of nationality."

He was named its first rector, M. Dunoyer continuing to hold the post of "curé of Geneva," and for some years afterwards his life was an uneventful one, passed partly in pastoral and parochial labors and partly in responding to the numerous invitations which besieged him to preach in France and elsewhere. Among the more famous of these sermons is one which should specially touch all English-speaking peoples. It was the famine year of 1862, which devastated all Ireland with its ravages, and the young preacher, whose heart vibrated with sympathy for every distress, whether moral or physical, ascended the pulpit of Ste. Clotilde, in Paris, to plead for the hunger stricken Irish. He gave as his text the words:

"I have compassion on the multitude because they have now been with me three days, and have nothing to eat." And, enlarging on these familiar words, he drew a thrilling picture of the poverty, the hunger, the ghastly distress of the peasantry, with the additional horror, so familiar to us now, that "fourteen Protestant societies expended their annual millions in tempting to apostasy the unhappy people who cried for bread. Let me proclaim aloud," he cried, in irrepressible indignation, "I declare here, before the holy altar, before this vast assembly, in the sight of God and of His angels, that if ever, I do not say a Pontiff or a priest, but even a simple layman, should attempt that ignoble propaganda which makes of the rich man a religious speculator on the misery of the poor, if ever a Catholic dared to enter the dwelling of a poor man and tempt his soul by such vile means, let his name be forever tarnished in face of the Faith, in the face of honor and before the public conscience. The priest who should protect such efforts would dishonor his priesthood forever, for the Church, that holy guardian of the liberty of souls, forbids such spiritual traffic and protests against this buying and selling of conscience."

The collection which followed this discourse was a scene never to be forgotten by those who witnessed it. Ladies stripped themselves of their bracelets, rings, jewels; men emptied their purses. One poor workman was heard to say as he threw his watch into the collecting plate: "One does not need to know the time when a nation is dying of hunger!" And a young student, amongst others, came into the sacristy, trembling with emotion, and handed to the preacher *the whole of his worldly goods*, consisting of the sum of forty francs, a touching homage to that land "whose pure and ardent patriotism," in the preacher's words, "is guarded by her women and blessed by her priests!"

Seldom, indeed, was the young preacher's tongue more eloquent, his words so powerful as when he touched upon the subject of patriotism.

"Never forget," he cried to the exiled children of Poland on another occasion, "that you are awaiting another Jeanne d'Arc. Only your Jeanne d'Arc, your deliverer—you know who she is to be! No other than the Catholic Church!"

The frequent visits of the Abbé Mermillod to the Eternal City had resulted in his being not only well known to, but *persona grata* to the venerable Head of the Church; but nothing could have been less anticipated than the imperious summons which, in the month of September, 1864, called him to the feet of Pius IX., there to learn, from the Pontiff's own lips, that he had resolved to consecrate him a Bishop. This the Holy Father proceeded to do with his own hands,

on the 24th of the same month, delivering a touching little allocution to the newly ordained Bishop and three others who had recently been invested with the same dignity, while tears of emotion gathered in his mild blue eyes and rolled down his withered cheeks as he exhorted his new-made brother to "go and gain for me that Geneva which dares to call itself the Protestant Rome; bless those peoples who may be ungrateful, but who are my children. Sustain, console the great Catholic family, and convert those whom heresy keeps back from the fold of Christ." His preconization was thus worded:

"For the episcopal see of Hebron, in *partibus infidelium*, the Reverend Gaspard Mermillod, of the Diocese of Geneva, named auxiliary, with residence at Geneva, of His Grace Mgr. Marilley, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva."

Some days later, when he went to take leave of his beloved Pontiff and friend ere returning to his new diocese, he could not refrain from expressing to that august confidant some of those fears for the future which necessarily suggested themselves even to so sanguine a mind as that of the young Bishop who was going back to face the outpoured hatred of a city whose very foundations were set in bitterest, most bigoted, most virulent persecution. The Pope told him not to fear, but to remember that the Holy Ghost guides the Church, and that his appointment was the work of the Holy Spirit through the Sovereign Pontiff.

So he returned—Bishop of Hebron in name, of Geneva in reality, to the place of his birth. His first episcopal act had been a telegram conveying his blessing to the clergy and people of Geneva; his first act on alighting within Swiss territory, to meet and receive the congratulations of his parents, his mother's greeting being: "Now, my son, I have but one more grace to ask of God for thee, that He would keep thee in humility." Then came the solemn entry into his beautiful Notre Dame, where Catholic and Protestant forgot for a moment their mutual antagonism to kneel side by side for his benediction, while the priest who had baptized him, just forty years before, hung round his neck a handsome pectoral cross.

It was soon found that the episcopal purple brought little change to the kindly, simple, self-sacrificing life of the former humble Swiss curé. The new "Bishop of Geneva" (for such, in truth, was and was well understood to be the so-called Bishop of Hebron) might have vied with his great predecessor, St. Francis of Sales, in the simplicity of his lodging as well as in the almost reckless generosity of his never failing alms. We interview-loving readers of to-day must needs know how his simple study held none but the barest necessities—a writing bureau, a set of bookshelves, a prie-dieu and crucifix, a few chairs and fewer pictures, the only non-religious one among them

being his mother's portrait, while the still humbler bedroom beyond contained the poorest and narrowest of iron bedsteads, curtained in rough serge, with the benitier surmounted by its bit of blessed palm and simple crucifix at its head.

His way of life was as simple as its setting. At six in the morning he rose and went down to his private chapel, where almost daily a group of penitents awaited his coming, and not until his confessional duties had been discharged did he say his daily Mass, as though he had been still a parish priest. After his thanksgiving he would take a cup of tea and then repair at once to his study, where the unfailing pile of letters and an often irksome succession of visitors filled the morning hours. All who came, all who wrote, men of business, religious disputants, souls in need, beggars of every degree, each received his utmost, his most kindly attention. Sometimes pacing to and fro within the narrow limits of his room, striving to prepare some important discourse or dictating rapidly letter after letter to his secretary and interrupted perhaps twenty times in the course of a morning, now by some rich idler in search of amusement, or half envious working man, comrade of former college days; his house was open to all. One *grande dame*, calling upon "the celebrated preacher" to beguile with his gentle presence some idle half hour, left in his hand at parting a twenty franc piece, in clumsy or haughty acknowledgment of her encroachment, and "Oh," said the long-suffering Bishop as he returned to his interrupted work, "I *did* feel inclined to say to her, 'Take back your money and return to me my wasted time!'"

Again, too, as before, his sermons, missions, retreats continued from one place to another. Again and again his voice was heard, before fashionable Parisian congregations or at still larger gatherings elsewhere, on some one of the burning questions of the day, notably that one, "la question ouvrière" as it was termed, which was only then beginning to be a prominent part of Christian ethics. His voice rang out with no uncertain sound as he told a vast assembly how "in crowning him (St. Joseph) it is Christian democracy which is crowned, it is the glorification of Labor."

Again he was urgent on the necessity for the Church's showing herself to be in the vanguard of progress, accepting and welcoming all modern inventions, all scientific discoveries: "Plus que personne nous devons saisir des forces sociales modernes, de l'électricité, des chemins de fer, pour préparer l'avènement du regne de Jésus Christ, de ce regne ou il n'y aura qu'un seul troupeau et un seul pasteur." And with this thought, when he was requested by the P. L. M. Railway Company to bless their new station at Geneva (for by a curious legalism the railway station at Geneva is French and not

Swiss territory), he caused a special "thanksgiving" service to be performed at his own beautiful Church of Notre Dame, and preached himself on "How the Church is the friend of modern progress in the domain of letters, arts and industries."

When the Vatican Council assembled, in 1869, the Holy Father summoned Monseigneurs Mermillod and Manning to his presence together, and in his own gracious way told them of his joy in welcoming the pastors of "the two dioceses which had not been represented at the Council of Trent, London and Geneva." And during his sojourn in the Eternal City the Bishop of Hebron, "thanks to his astounding activity, which enabled him to be everywhere and at everything at once," as Louis Veuillot wrote of him, "was occupied as incessantly as ever in preaching at one church after another."

On the 18th of July, 1870, the doctrine of Papal infallibility was solemnly proclaimed by Pius IX. in council, and on the following day war was declared between France and Germany. Two months later Rome was in the hands of the Piedmontese, the Pope a prisoner in the Vatican and the members of the interrupted Council scattered far and wide, returning to their own dioceses. The "Bishop of Hebron" on his return lost no time in announcing from the pulpit the newly defined dogma; but the displeasure of the Genevan Government at this (as they deemed it) daring action was momentarily set aside by the more immediately pressing political events which absorbed all thoughts. Bourbaki's fugitive army, 80,000 strong, had crossed the border and taken refuge in Switzerland, where, billeted here and there in the different cantons, their destitute and suffering condition appealed not unsuccessfully to the pity of their Swiss hosts. Monseigneur Mermillod was foremost in the many good works set on foot in aid of the wounded or famine-stricken soldiers, and his love of the poor, his ever open hand and generous heart were taxed to the uttermost on their behalf.

But when political matters became less stormy without, a blacker cloud arose upon the horizon at home. A certain M. Carteret, a fanatical Protestant, took advantage of his appointment to a prominent post in the government to declare open war against Catholicism, and his first step was to procure the banishment of the humble Christian Brothers, who ever since M. Vuarin's time had lived and worked in the city. Their Bishop flew to defend them and poured forth an indignant protest from the pulpit on the 11th of August, 1872. It was not the first time he had opposed M. Carteret, who bitterly disliked him, and the answer of his opponent came swiftly. On the 30th of the same month a decree of the Council of State enjoined on Mgr. Mermillod to "abstain from any act which he might perform as vicar general or bishop's delegate."

Mgr. Mermillod replied "that he would submit the matter to his ecclesiastical superiors."

Six days afterwards he was summoned to appear in person before the Council and to give an answer, in its presence, to the following question:

"Does Monsieur Mermillod, the curé of Geneva, intend to conform, from the present moment, to the prescriptions of the Council of State contained in its letter of the 30th of August?"

Without a moment's hesitation Mgr. Mermillod dictated his reply to the Chancellor of the Council:

"Monseigneur Mermillod does not recognize the competence of the Council of State in a question of spiritual administration, . . . he therefore cannot relinquish his spiritual functions until the spiritual authority which confided them to him takes them back. Never, since 1815, have vicars general been either accepted or suspended by any Council of State. Consequently Mgr. Mermillod cannot yield to the orders and the threats of the Council of State to cease exercising the functions of Auxiliary Bishop and vicar general; it is a case of duty, of inviolable fidelity to the rights of the Church, which are compatible with devotion to his country.

(Signed)

"GASPARD MERMILLOD,
"Bishop of Hebron."

"Well," cried M. Carteret bitterly as they stood face to face, "it is a case of war between us two. We shall see who will gain the victory!"

The Bishop retired, calm and unmoved, and the Council continued its debate, Carteret exclaiming excitedly:

"We must draw up an article preventing Monsieur Mermillod from being curé any more. Courage, gentlemen; *no half measures!*"

On which a fellow-Councillor gravely commented:

"I confess I feel very little courage when it is a question of laying hands upon the conscience of my neighbor."

But Carteret's more violent counsels prevailed, and on the 20th of the same month (September) two decrees were issued by the government which enacted that "Monsieur" Mermillod thereby ceased to be recognized as curé of Geneva, was forbidden to exercise any ecclesiastical function, and his stipend was withdrawn. A storm of indignation burst from his people and from the whole Catholic world when these decrees were made public. Addresses of sympathy or more energetic remonstrances poured in on all sides. The well-known Catholic champion, Louis Veuillot, immediately opened a subscription list in the pages of the *Univers* to supply for the withheld stipend of the Genevese "curé," which in the course of a few days amounted to 25,000 francs and was closed by a Papal donation of 2,000 francs.

Monseigneur Marilley, the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, whose "suffragan" Mgr. Mermillod in reality was, now formally resigned his sway over the Genevan portion of his diocese, which

thus lapsed to the direct authority of Rome, and the Pope, finding negotiation useless, appointed as vicar general of Geneva direct from himself, by special brief, Monseigneur Mermillod! The brief was dated January 16, 1873.

On receiving from the Papal Nuncio at Berne the brief in question, which was officially communicated also to the Council of State, Mgr. Mermillod notified its contents to the faithful in a circular which was read in all the pulpits of the canton on Sunday, February 2, and that same evening Carteret convoked a special meeting of the Council, at which he proposed to seize Mgr. Mermillod and put him in prison.

His proposition was rejected, but another carried, in which the Council summoned the recalcitrant Bishop to declare "within twenty-four hours, before midday on Saturday," whether he would persist in fulfilling the functions of Vicar Apostolic, or renounce them according to the injunctions already served on him by the cantonal and federal authorities.

The Bishop replied within the prescribed period in a document of some length, stating that he "must remain faithful to the eternal principle, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.'"

He himself expected the answer to this statement to be immediate imprisonment, and begged his flock, should this take place, to "believe no false reports" as to his having swerved from this position. On the following day, Sunday, he preached as usual at Notre Dame, referring to the question of the hour in his usual half genial, half sarcastic way, with "The Genevans would die of ennui if they had not the interests of the Catholics to discuss;" and the next day, Monday, as he sat reading his morning paper as usual, he came to the words: "The Federal Council of Switzerland has just passed a decree banishing Mgr. Mermillod from Swiss territory."

He took up his pen to write a telegram contradicting the report, but while he was in the act of writing it his servant rushed into the room with tears in his eyes, and behind him—a police officer.

"This time, Monseigneur, you must prepare to leave. I have orders to arrest you. Here is the warrant."

"Very well, I accept it," replied the Bishop, holding out his hand for the document. "It will be my passport to heaven!"

He passed into the next room, followed by the police officer, and there, surrounded by his priests, he dictated to his secretary an energetic protest against his illegal arrest. Then, after paying a last visit to the church and praying for a few moments before the Blessed Sacrament, he stepped into the carriage which awaited him, escorted by a body of police, who conveyed him across the frontier

and left him on French territory, close to the little village of Ferney. "Well," said the illustrious exile with a flash of his old gaiety, "here is Calvin sending me to Voltaire! How are they going to agree together?" And he walked on to the humble village presbytery and asked shelter of its curé.

Hardly had the exiled Bishop left his native soil before the gist of M. Carteret's manœuvres became apparent; for only two days later the Genevese Grand Council (an assembly, be it remembered, composed exclusively of Protestants and free thinkers) voted "the reorganization of the Catholic Church."

The series of articles which they proceeded to draw up are too long to be inserted here, but their aim was, in brief, to reduce Catholicism in Geneva to a State Church somewhat on the lines of "Anglicanism" in England; and they were deluded enough to believe that a large percentage, at least, of the Catholic clergy would embrace their proposals, Carteret himself having the effrontery to exclaim with an expressive gesture in the Council chamber: "Cut the cords of the purse and you will see how the clergy will yield to a compromise!" The would-be reformers, however, had the mortification of finding not only that every single Catholic priest in the canton rejected their proposals with scorn, but even Protestants and infidels (Ernest Rénan among them) loudly condemned their attempt.

The modest little village of Ferney now became a centre for pilgrimages, visits, processions, deputations from all parts. One incessant stream of friends, admirers, indignant supporters flocked there to lay their homage at the exile's feet, and he was soon obliged to hire a small house, formerly occupied by Voltaire's niece and immediately opposite to the Château Voltaire, in which to receive his numerous visitors.

Meanwhile the Genevan Government, irritated by their non-success, set to work in earnest. They seized one after another the churches and chapels of the canton, ejecting priests from their presbyteries and banishing such as were not of Swiss nationality. They sent to M. Loyson, the unfrocked Carmelite, inviting him to come and give a series of conferences in Geneva, to teach "*Old Catholicism*." And he went. Then various suspended or otherwise "irregular" priests, tempted by the "loaves and fishes" held out to them, flocked in to fill the places of the expelled Catholic priests, ministering to miscellaneous flocks of malcontents and unbelievers who flaunted their false liberty and license in public journals and assemblies. M. Loyson and two of his associates were "elected" to the "triple curé" of Geneva, this curious arrangement being explained as "lest one curé alone should have too much power," and many disgraceful scenes took place.

A howling mob, with a police officer at its head, broke open the doors of the Church of St. Germain, flooded the sanctuary, refused permission to the curé even to carry away the Blessed Sacrament until the Council of State, appealed to, authorized the action, and Loyson was installed there. Next morning the same turbulent crowd attacked Notre Dame and surged impotently between church and presbytery all day long until dispersed by the police and the firemen with a jet of water from a fire engine! For Notre Dame could hardly be ceded so lightly, even by the high-handed Genevese Government. It was indisputably private property—the property of the Catholics of all nations, whose money had built it—while the site was a gift from the town to “the Catholics of Geneva.” So, when the rumor went abroad that it was to be ceded to the schismatics, a cry of indignation went up from the Catholics in all countries, who *claimed their own*, from Pope Pius IX. himself to the representatives of the English subscribers, Lords Denbigh and Gainsborough. So many that the printed report of these protests alone fills a volume of ninety-two pages.

But all was in vain. The Genevan Government, while not daring openly to seize Notre Dame, gave secret encouragement to a so-called “Protestant Commission” to do so; and very early one morning, while the priests in the neighboring presbytery were still asleep, a little band of robbers—a juge de paix, a locksmith and some police officers—stole up to the great door and forced the lock, afterwards affixing the government seals. While they were at work the priests rose as usual and perceived what was going on. They rushed to the doors in a vain attempt to defend their beloved church, and M. Lany, one of the curates, with his brother priests, fought his way in through the mocking, struggling crowd, seized the ciborium which held the Blessed Sacrament and carried it in safety to a convent near, while the venerable rector, M. Dunoyer, was being dragged down the steps by the gendarmes, amid the applause of a handful of Protestants who shouted “à l’eau! à l’eau,” their old savage cry. The white-haired successor of M. Vuarin, thus doubly insulted and bereaved, never recovered, either physically or mentally, from the shock, and sank into a premature grave.

The summer of 1873 passed in one long round of pastoral duties as before, for the Bishop’s exile had but increased his ever-abundant labors a hundred fold. Without once infringing on Swiss territory he passed from village to village, from town to town, preaching, visiting, holding confirmations, everywhere welcomed with open arms, with tears of affection, with garlanded paths and triumphal arches, till the passage of the exiled and insulted vicar general became one long triumphal march. His enemies within the city were

furious and tried to force the French Government to banish him in their turn; but this much was not conceded to their hatred, and they were forced to be unwilling witnesses of a triumph as genuine as it was unexpected. They contrived, however, to continue their persecutions. The ninety-seven curés of the Bernese Jura, part of the formerly French and newly annexed territory within his diocese, having declared in writing that they remained faithful to their Bishop, were immediately suspended from their posts and exiled from Switzerland, in defiance of the "Act of Union" of 1815, in which the Swiss Government, taking over this portion of French territory, promised entire freedom in religion to their new Catholic subjects.

Exiled and penniless, these ninety-seven confessors took refuge within the French frontier, and there, suffering but steadfast, they watched over their flocks from afar. "They are there, sad but unconquerable," wrote a passer-by some time later of the little band of exiled priests. "They were ninety-seven at the beginning, and now, after two years and a half, not one has deserted." From time to time they crossed the frontier in disguise by night to minister to their bereaved flocks. They visited the sick, they heard confessions, they said Mass in secret, in some loft or cellar, and disappeared again as silently as they had come; while their Bishop, on whom the onus of their support necessarily fell, was working his hardest at the erection and maintenance of various chapels and missions in other parts of his diocese.

In Geneva itself every convent, hospital, orphanage and other good work was swept away, and as one contemporary writer remarks, "in bygone times Calvinist intolerance tried to send the French resident to Mass across the frontier; to-day, being unable to proscribe the Mass, it proscribes charity and sends the orphans, the sick and the poor *across the frontier*."

A fortunate chance enabled the Catholic body to buy a "Masonic Temple," no other than the one built on a companion site (of former city walls) to the Church of Notre Dame, and the congregation of St. Germain migrated thither when consecrated under the title of "L'Eglise du Sacré Cœur." A second chapel, that of Notre Dame des Paquis,* received the dispersed congregation of Notre Dame; that of St. François de Paul rose in another quarter, and the most crowded parish church of all, that of St. Joseph, was bought back by a generous layman and is at present the only original parish church in Geneva restored to Catholic worship.

During the ten years of his exile Mgr. Mermillod saw no less than thirty new churches and chapels erected within his persecuted and

* The Empress of Austria was assassinated close to this chapel, and one of its vicars gave her the last rites of the Church, on September 10, 1898.

dispossessed diocese. The expenses of their erection and maintenance rested, as usual, upon his shoulders, and again he took up his pilgrim staff and went from church to church and from town to town, preaching and pleading for his orphaned people. We are told that more than a hundred thousand francs were annually spent upon this work, gathered almost entirely from France and Belgium, as the fruits of his preaching in these countries. With redoubled activity he had journeyed hither and thither, preaching sometimes as much as five and six times in one day; while to the pitying spectators who noted his labored breath, his swollen throat and aching breast, and begged him to take some period of repose, he announced only: "I shall have Eternity to rest in!"

Ten years passed thus, and then a new and unexpected turn of events took the wondering world by surprise. The Bishop of Lausanne, Mgr. Cosandez, died in 1882, and it rested with the Holy See, as usual, to name his successor. For some five months the see remained vacant; and then, one evening—it was the 14th of March, 1883—Leo XIII. sent for Mgr. Mermillod, who was in Rome, and told him how, after five long months of prayer and examination of the question, he, the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost, had "of his own personal initiative, resolution and decision," determined to name the exiled Bishop of Hebron to the vacant see.

"My heart full of emotion and my eyes of tears, I could only answer: 'The will of the Pope is the will of God!'" wrote Mgr. Mermillod to his Genevan brethren next day. "All that I am is at your service henceforth—my powers, my devotion, my life."

The preconization of the new Bishop took place on the following day, March 15, in a public consistory at the Vatican, and the news, flashed to Fribourg and all over Switzerland with brief delay, awoke a great thrill of joy within that pious and convent crowded city, "the little Rome," as its inhabitants still love to call it; while the Federal Council, glad, no doubt, to put an end to the unseemly and strained situation of so many years past, revoked on its side the decree of exile and prepared to receive the new-old Bishop of Fribourg-Lausanne—and Geneva.

His arrival in Fribourg was welcomed with the greatest rejoicings, with garlanded streets and festive decorations, while on his part no word of triumph or any reference to his long exile was heard. He seemed to come among them overflowing with love, with tenderness, with the most exquisite charity towards all, even as he had written to them from Rome in announcing his arrival, "count on my heart, as I on my side crave to feel myself loved by you."

He threw himself heart and soul into his episcopal work, preached occasionally outside his own diocese and took part in every pious

work or pilgrimage which asked his presence. In 1889 his grateful people insisted on celebrating with great pomp his "silver jubilee" to the episcopate, and although his humility yearned to commemorate it in silence, he yielded to their wishes, and a splendid "function" and series of fêtes crowned the close of his twenty-five years of episcopal life.

Not long after this undesired but well merited triumph he was obliged by failing health to leave for a time the scene of his labors and to pass the winter of 1889-90 in Cannes and Rome. Here he occupied himself in the interests of his diocese, especially in one project which lay very near his heart, the establishment of a Catholic University in Fribourg; and when the balmy month of May seemed to give promise of speedy return to his northern home he presented himself before the Pope in what he believed to be an audience of farewell. But the Pontiff who had summoned him greeted him with these words: "This is not a visit of farewell! You are to remain here in Rome until the next consistory; for my will is to create you Cardinal. It is a legitimate recompense, for you have worked and suffered much for the Church." His hearer, surprised and much moved, found voice to reply with, "Holy Father, to work and to suffer for the Church is in itself the greatest honor and the highest recompense that God can deign to give to a man called to such mission." "That is true," answered Leo XIII., "but the Church must also be just and grateful; that is why I wish to make you a Cardinal. It is I myself who have chosen you, without any human intervention. I have it at heart to show my affection for Switzerland, as I have already done for England and the United States."

So, on the 25th of June, in the Vatican, Monseigneur Mermillod received the Cardinal's hat from the hands of the Supreme Pontiff himself, with the words: "The whole world knows the trials, the lengthened labors, the exile you have endured to serve the cause of the Church and of its Head. All men know, too, your indefatigable zeal for the faith and for the salvation of souls, as well as the efficacy of your words for enlightening intelligences and drawing hearts to God. But if the Cardinalate be a recompense for services rendered and a stimulant towards rendering more, we will also that it should be a fresh proof of our consideration and of our special regard for that Switzerland whose son you are."

A series of fêtes and ovations followed, with the stately ceremony of installation in his titular Basilica, that of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, and his return to Switzerland was one long triumphal procession. The remainder of that summer—after a short sojourn in Fribourg—he passed, in but indifferent health, in a little property of his own near Geneva called the Château de Monthoux.

Then, what was in all truth another cross, and not a light one, though scarcely suspected at the time, came upon him. The Holy Father summoned him again to Rome and signified his wish that the new Cardinal should take up his abode there and—as a necessary consequence—resign the See of Fribourg.

Probably his own failing health would soon have rendered this step necessary, but none the less it came upon him as a blow. His passionate patriotism, innate in almost every Swiss heart, and specially prominent in his, made any other country than his own, even Rome, a land of exile; and the grief he felt at being again separated from the land of his birth grew into a long drawn agony which ceased but with his life. "*C'est le Cardinalat qui l'a tué,*" said one of his intimate friends to the present writer; and little as it was guessed at the time, there is little doubt now that it was so. In obedience to the wish of the Pope he resigned his see and consecrated with his own hands his successor, Mgr. Deruaz, in the Canadian Chapel at Rome, on the 19th of March, 1891.

The following summer he passed at Monthoux, the internal malady which consumed him making rapid progress, and then, as it was hoped that the mild air of Rome might retard his end, he was brought back there by slow and easy stages, and lingered for some months until, in the month of February, an attack of influenza supervened and his strength failed rapidly. As he lay dying, surrounded by relatives and friends, he showed the same gracious, kindly sweetness of word and demeanor which had ever characterized him. The watchers who knelt by his bedside would receive from his trembling hand not one, but five or six "*signes de croix*" upon their foreheads when voice had failed; for "in death, as in life, he was never tired of giving benedictions." While life was ebbing his secretary came from the Vatican bearing the last Papal Benediction to his dying master, who lifted the hand of the welcome messenger to his lips in token of grateful recognition, and not long afterwards sank gradually into unconsciousness and breathed his last on February 23, 1892.

Eleven Cardinals in full state and vast crowds of clergy and people followed the simple coffin "without flowers or state," according to his expressed desire, to the Carthusian vault within the same stately basilica where Pius IX., his friend and father, lay, and "He will have a great reward," spoke Leo XIII. to his sorrowing family as they knelt before him some days later. "He was looked upon by every one as an apostle and a saint."

"Monseigneur Mermillod," says a recent writer in one of the French reviews, "is assuredly one of the most sympathetic figures

of the second half of the nineteenth century. A marvelous gift of eloquence and a charming amenity of manner were added in his person to every priestly virtue. The charm of his manner was but equaled by the dignity of his life and the ardor of his zeal and charity. Very popular in the highest society, he was especially the friend of the humble and the obscure, and was one of the first to dare to preach before the rich and the powerful in support of the claims of the working classes. His enemies accused him of ambition and social intrigue. His ambition was—to bring back his country to its ancient faith, to reconcile his beloved Geneva with Rome. He proved that he had no other ambition by refusing the flattering advances made to him by the French Government, which offered him successively the Bishopric of Nice and the Archbishopric of Chambery. As to his politics, his former fellow-workers, those who were the best fitted to know him intimately, declared that he had none. With his delicate minded and generous nature, all sentiment and confiding goodness, he could never divine in others a maliciousness of which he felt himself to be incapable. His great mistake was never to have doubted the loyalty of his enemies, and his great illusion, to believe that the republican and democratic institutions of his country, for which he had a perfect enthusiasm, were a sort of inviolable palladium for the Catholic apostolate."

T. L. L. TEELING.

London.

THE TEMPORAL POWER.

FOR Catholics the momentous question of the day, religious and quasi-political, is that of the Pope's Temporal Power. Nor does it concern Catholics alone, but the whole world. For, indirectly, the whole world—Catholic and non-Catholic, Christian and non-Christian—is interested in its settlement; first on grounds of abstract justice, to see that a great wrong is righted; secondly, because on its due solution the tranquillity and contentment of the world, to some extent, depend. As long as the Roman Pontiff remains a prisoner in his own city, practically under the lock and key of a usurper, so long will this politico-religious difficulty remain an open sore and so long will two hundred million Catholics, scattered throughout the world, be restless and unwilling to accept the *status quo*. Directly, however, the question affects the Christian nations alone, for they alone by baptism are subjects of the Church.

Moreover, in practice, it concerns Catholics only. Its bearing on Protestants is chiefly of a speculative character, since far from admitting the Pope's jurisdiction over them, they emphatically deny it. At the lowest they are indifferent, and in the main they are hostile. Indeed, had it not been for the moral and material support of Protestants in general, and of British Protestants in particular, the revolutionary Italians in 1870 could not have accomplished this crying act of injustice—the usurpation and spoliation of Rome.

Nine times before has Rome been captured by the enemies of the Papacy, and nine times was the peace of Europe disturbed. Moreover, that peace was never once restored except by the restoration of the Temporal Power.

Taking stock of the confronting forces on this great battlefield of religion and politics, we find ranged, on one side the compact army of sound and well-informed Catholics, and on the other side a motley array of infidels, revolutionists, communists, most non-Catholic Christians, many liberal—that is, unsound—Catholics and lastly not a few Catholics who err, not from malice, but from inculpable ignorance. These last are ignorant for want of due instruction on this vital question. That such ignorance exists probably no one would care to deny. Differences of opinion in matters of minor detail are legitimate enough, but it is surely a curious sign of the times to find Catholics—and sometimes Catholics who ought to know better—professing the laxest views on this all-important question.

I propose in this article to set forth, as far as I understand them, our obligations in regard to the Temporal Power, and the grounds of those obligations. However, before entering on the specific topic of the Pope's Civil Princedom, there are some preliminary questions which I intend to touch on by way of clearing the ground. This seems all the more necessary, since the most exaggerated views have at times been current as to what the Holy Father's temporal powers really are—as to their nature, their limits and their necessity. On the one hand the extravagant opinion has been propounded by some theologians—Henry of Segusia, Augustinus Triumphus, Alvarus Pelagius—that the Pope's direct temporal power is coextensive with the earth.¹ More unbalanced still in their opinions, some few—Hostiensis, for example²—have taught that by Christ's coming all heathen lands were confiscated to the Pope, and that he, consequently, could assign them to whomsoever he chose. On the other hand, Calvin, Peter Martyr and others defended the heretical opinion that the Roman Pontiff, as such, was *de jure divino* debarred from all

¹ This opinion is emphatically denied by Bellarmine. "Tertia Controversia Generalis;" "De Rom. Pontif," v., 1; cf. Hergenröther, "The Catholic Church and the Christian State"—Essay 13, part 2, sec. 3. ² Bellarmine l. c.

temporal powers and possessions and that for him to bear a temporal sword was a hall-mark of Anti-Christ.

I begin then by laying down four introductory propositions which I will number for the sake of clearness.

The first proposition is this, that in no sense whatever has the Roman Pontiff direct temporal jurisdiction over the whole world. He has, indeed, jurisdiction, temporal but indirect, over all Christians scattered over the whole world; but nothing more. What, however, is meant by direct and indirect jurisdiction? The two terms play an important part in this discussion, and therefore call for clear definition. By *direct* temporal jurisdiction I mean that which is exercised primarily for the advancement of temporal interests; by *indirect*, that which is exercised for the furtherance primarily of spiritual and only secondarily of temporal interests. That the Pope has no spiritual or temporal, direct or indirect, jurisdiction over the whole world is obvious from the fact that Christ gave him none. Our Lord's command to "go and teach all nations" gave only the right to preach and conferred no jurisdiction over all.

The second proposition is this, that the Pope has no direct temporal authority even over the Christian world. Direct spiritual authority he has, conferred by the words, "Feed My sheep, feed My lambs." But neither Scripture nor Apostolic Tradition shows any trace of any such direct temporal jurisdiction. When to Peter and his successors Christ gave "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," that gift carried with it direct spiritual, but not direct temporal, authority over Christendom. Were it otherwise, an infidel king, by conversion to Christianity, would forfeit his throne to the Pope—which is absurd. Therefore it is that the Church says in the Vespers of the Epiphany:

Crudelis Herodes, Deum
Regem venire quid times?
Non eripit mortalia,
Qui regna dat coelestia.

The third proposition is this, that the Roman Pontiff has temporal power, supreme but indirect, not over the whole world, but over all Christendom. Not over the whole world; for the direct spiritual and the indirect temporal powers are coextensive, and as the former does not embrace the whole world, so neither does the latter. But over all Christendom; for as that is the extension of the spiritual power, so also must it be the extension of the temporal. For the indirect temporal is but an aspect of the spiritual power, and was given concomitantly with the spiritual.

It is essential to notice that this indirect temporal power is temporal but in name and is spiritual in reality. It concerns the temporal aspect of spiritual things and the spiritual aspect of temporal

things. Hergenröther,³ in an admirable essay on this subject, writes: "This indirect power of the Church in matters temporal . . . is not a temporal, but a spiritual power. It is exerted in matters temporal only in so far as they trench upon religion and thus cease to be purely temporal."

It follows then that within certain due and well defined limits the civil is subordinate to the spiritual power. And reasonably so, since the end of the former is temporal and mediate, that of the latter spiritual and final. The one promotes temporal interests, the other eternal salvation. Nevertheless both Church and State have their own clearly defined spheres into which the other has no right to intrude. Hence St. Bernard wrote: "When temporal rulers make no opposition to the divine law, they then hold their kingdoms and their rights entire and with full power."⁴ Both these spheres are, however, concentric and the radius of the ecclesiastical sphere is greater than the radius of the civil sphere, so that while the State has no power outside her own circumference, the Church has direct spiritual power throughout her whole circumference and indirect temporal power within the circumference of the State. However, this leaves the State absolute mistress within her own proper domain. If, for example, the State cannot define doctrines, so neither may the Church command conscription. Therefore St. Thomas writes:⁵ "The secular power is under the spiritual power in so far as it is placed under it by God; that is to say, in those things that concern the salvation of souls. Consequently therein we must obey the spiritual rather than the temporal authority. But, in what belongs to the civil sphere, we must obey the temporal rather than the spiritual authority, according to those words, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but unto God the things that are God's.'" This indirect temporal power—direct as to the moral law, indirect as to the temporal matters involved—Christ exercised when He drove the buyers and sellers from the Temple, and again when He cast the Gadarene swine into the sea; and the Pope exercised it when he condemned the Plan of Campaign in Ireland, the Falk Laws in Germany, the Divorce Courts in Christendom, when he upheld the claims of the French Republic, when he denounced the claims of the Italian monarchy.

Our fourth proposition runs thus, that the Roman Pontiff is, by divine right, exempt from and superior to all secular authority and civil jurisdiction of whatsoever kind or degree. This doctrine is an accepted conclusion of theology and is thus enunciated by Suarez:⁶ "The Roman Pontiff is free and exempt from all secular judgment

³ L. c., sec 4. ⁴ Ep. 255. Migne. P. L. Tom. 182, col. 462. ⁵ L. II., Sent. d. etq. ult. ⁶ Contra Sectam Anglic, L. 4, c. 4, n. 3.

and jurisdiction, even of Emperors and of Kings. This doctrine is held by all Catholic doctors who declare this exemption to be a divine right."

But in what sense "a divine right?" To answer that question clearly we must define our terms. What then is "a divine right?" St. Thomas says pithily: "Divine is that right which is made known to us by revelation."⁷ Revelation, or promulgation, is, however, two-fold—natural (or non-positive) and positive; natural when it is implicitly given, as a logical concomitant or reasonable consequence of some supernatural dignity conferred by God on man; positive when it is given explicitly by God. As, therefore, a supernatural dignity expressly bestowed would be *de jure divino positivo*, its logical concomitant or necessary consequence, though not expressly mentioned, would be *de jure divino naturali*. In this acceptance of the term "natural" as distinguished, not against "supernatural," but against "positive," the positive precedes the natural as the cause precedes the effect.⁸

Papal exemption is then a divine right, but is it a positive or a natural right? Was it conferred on St. Peter and the Roman Pontiffs explicitly and directly by Christ's special and peculiar will, or is it merely connatural to and logically deducible from the spiritual dignity of the Head of Christendom? Suarez explains it to be a divine right in both senses, natural and positive; but positive only in a secondary way.

It is *de jure divino naturali* because as Christ constituted Peter and the Roman Pontiffs the Supreme Head in spirituals, it follows logically that He must also have conferred on His Vicar exemption from the secular jurisdiction of all and any of his spiritual subjects. A subject may not be the sovereign of his own Sovereign Lord. Suarez, however,⁹ admits that this deduction is not without its difficulties. For might not an opponent argue that the Pope's supreme and direct spiritual jurisdiction and his supreme but indirect temporal jurisdiction on the one hand were not incompatible with his direct temporal subjection on the other? Does an official's superiority over another in one respect prevent his subjection to that other in another respect? Is not a King's mother superior to her son, but inferior to the King, just as the King as a son is inferior to his mother, but superior as her King? Without denying a certain cogency to this objection Suarez¹⁰ replies: "Nevertheless the connection between the privilege of Exemption and the dignity of Spiritual Head, if not fully evident, is at least most consonant to reason; and in many ways. First, because the superior who gives jurisdiction is

⁷ "Jus divinum dicitur quod divinitus promulgatur," 2-2, 57, 2, ad. 3m. ⁸ Cf. Schiffini. "Disp. Phil. Mor.," Vol. I., u. n. 195, 198. Suarez, Contra Sect. Aug., 4, 4-6. ⁹ l. c., n. 8. ¹⁰ l. c., n. 9.

also held to give all the adjuncts necessary for its due execution. Now, that the Pope may exercise his spiritual office over all Christians, princes and people, it is morally necessary that he should be himself subject to none of them. . . . For it is certainly unmeet that the Supreme Head of the Church, to whom all Christian princes are subject, should be judged, constrained or punished by any of them. Again, the Pope's secular subjection would be a standing cause of parties and divisions. Moreover, the Pope could not, with due liberty and authority, exercise his spiritual jurisdiction and use his indirect temporal power over princes if at the same time he was himself civilly subject to them and they were able legitimately to imprison and punish him. Therefore Papal Immunity is *de jure divino naturali*."

But the Pope's Immunity is also *de jure divino positivo*¹¹ in this sense, not that Christ's explicit word first created the privilege, but only afterwards declared it. For Immunity is a logical deduction from the Spiritual Primacy, and the positive right superadded only declared explicitly the deduction to be true. Exemption already implicitly existing in the divine law, Christ, by a positive act, explicitly affirmed so to exist.

The classical proof of this positive and confirmatory act of our Lord is drawn from the Payment of the Tribute Scene in St. Matthew (xvii., 24-27), which reads thus:

"And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus forestalled him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? Of whom do the Kings of the earth take custom or tribute? Of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto Him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should scandalize them, go thou to the sea and cast an hook and take up the fish that first cometh up, and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a stater; take that, and give it to them for Me and for thee."

Thus Christ pays the tax for two, since the poll tax was two drachmas, and one stater equaled four drachmas. He paid, not because He and His Vicar were subject to the law, but to avoid scandal of the ignorant. Yet though He and Peter paid, nevertheless they were not taxed. The tax gatherers received the money, yet neither Christ nor Peter was mulcted of it. It was taken neither from their earnings nor from the common purse. Christ, therefore, a "Child of the King"—God—worked a striking miracle in order—without scandalizing the weak—to vindicate exemption and immu-

¹¹ Suarez, l. c., cap. 5.

ity from the law, both for Himself and for His Vicar, St. Peter, and in St. Peter for the whole line of the Roman Pontiffs.

We have now cleared the horizon by the brief statement of these four propositions; that the Pope has direct temporal power neither over the whole world, nor over the whole Christian world; that he has power—supreme, direct, spiritual, and supreme, indirect, temporal—over all Christendom, but not over heathendom; and that he is exempt from and superior to all secular authority whatsoever. We may now more conveniently pass on to our main investigation into the nature of the Roman Pontiff's *de jure* civil sovereignty over Rome and the Roman States. Of what right is it, divine or only human?

I reply that over no territory whatsoever has the Pope by divine right, natural or positive, direct temporal sovereignty. Therefore, not over Rome.

He has not a divine positive right, for no express command of God to that effect is found in either Scripture or Apostolic Tradition.

He has not a divine natural (*i. e.*, non-positive, but implicit) right deducible by reason as a corollary of his spiritual dignity of Supreme Pontiff. Of such a right there is no proof, as I shall now show.

Bellarmino and Suarez both deny the existence of such divine right, whether natural or positive.

Bellarmino's¹² argument is this, that since Christ, as Man, while He lived on earth, willed not Himself to possess temporal and territorial sovereignty over any particular province or city, so neither did He give any such sovereignty to St. Peter and his successors. It becomes, therefore, of importance to investigate what Christ's temporal authority before His Passion was. Christ, as God, was, of course, Sovereign of the Universe, but His authority as God He did not, and indeed could not, transfer to His Vicar. Again, Christ, as Man, was the spiritual Sovereign of all men, so that He could, and did, bind all men, under sanction of heaven or of hell, to accept His religion. By this direct spiritual, and therefore by its concomitant indirect temporal, jurisdiction Christ could dispose of all temporal possessions, as He did—to cite again the instances already quoted—when He overturned the tables of the money changers and indirectly caused the destruction of the Gadarene swine.¹³ Moreover, Christ, even as Man, could—had He willed—have assumed territorial Lordship of the whole earth. He had the power to do so, but that power He did not will to exercise. Hence not only He did not exercise territorial dominion, He did not even possess it. For Temporal Principdom is built on one or more of these four titles—inheritance, popular election, conquest, divine donation—and Christ had none of them.

¹² De Rom. Pont., cap. 4. ¹³ Mk. v., 13; Mt. xxi., 12.

Not inheritance. For though descended from the royal family of David, there is no evidence that He was a nearer heir than a multitude of others of the same stock. Moreover, there was no throne in Judah to inherit, for the sceptre had passed out of David's family, and that, too, as it seems, with God's approval. For, speaking in God's name, Jeremiah the prophet¹⁴ had clearly foretold that abolition of Jewish sovereignty. He predicted that no offspring of Jehoiakin, King of Judah, should sit upon David's temporal throne: "Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for no man of his seed shall prosper sitting upon the throne of David and ruling any more in Judah." And again:¹⁵ "Thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakin, King of Judah: He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David." Now Christ was a descendant of Jehoiakin—or Jechonias—as St. Matthew expressly tells us.¹⁶ Therefore as the prophecy was necessarily true, it must necessarily be false that Christ ever sat as temporal King on the throne of Judah.¹⁷ Nor may we argue that Jeremiah's was inconsistent with Gabriel's prediction that "the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father."¹⁸ For both fathers and theologians explain that the prophet refers to a temporal, but the archangel to a spiritual throne.¹⁹

Not election by the people. Our Lord's own words prove this; for when He was invited to intervene, as a King might, in a dispute He replied: "Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?"²⁰ And should it be argued that the sceptre was at least offered to Christ, the reply is obvious that neither was it the people's to give nor did He accept it: "When Jesus perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone."²¹

Not conquest in war. For Christ's warfare was not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and with powers, with the rulers of this world of darkness, with the spirit of wickedness in high

¹⁴ Jer. xxii., 30. ¹⁵ xxxvi., 30. ¹⁶ Matt. i., 11. ¹⁷ To invalidate this argument it has been objected, for example, in Smith's "Dict. of the Bible," s. r. "Jehoiachin," that Jeremiah's prophecy referred only to the childless Jehoiachin, the last of Solomon's (though not of David's) line; but that the right of succession duly passed to the line of Nathan, son of David, whose descendant, Salathiel, the son of Neri, was consequently called by St. Matthew i., 12, the son of Jehoiachin (or Jechonias): "Jechonias begat Salathiel." But this explanation seems very strained, not to say unnecessary. Professor N. J. White, in Hastings' "Dict. of the Bible," II., p. 557, writes: "Needless difficulty has been raised over the question of Jehoiachin's children. Whatever be the truth as to the parentage of Salathiel, the very prophecy which is alleged to prove his childlessness (Jer. xxii., 28) mentions his seed twice. Like Ezk. xxi., 26, it is a declaration of the abrogation of the temporal power of David's line. It explains in what sense he was to be 'childless' (*ἐκθρονισμένος*—'proscribed'), 'for no man of his seed shall prosper,' words surely unnecessary if he had no seed at all." ¹⁸ Lk. i., 32. ¹⁹ Cf. Ambrose, in Lk., L. 3, c. 1. Migne, P. L. Tom. 15, col. 1807. Jerome, in Jer. xxii., 30. Migne, P. L. Tom. 24, col. 819. Augustine, "De Civ. Dei," L. 17, c. 7. Migne, P. L. Tom. 41, col. 538. Bellarmine, "De Rom. Pont." v., 4. Suarez, "De Incar." xlviii., 1-3. ²⁰ Lk. xxii., 14. ²¹ Jo. vi., 15.

places. This title Christ had, not to a temporal, but to His spiritual kingdom.

Not a divine donation. For there is no proof of any such gift. Nay, there is clear proof against it. To relieve Pilate of all suspicion that He aimed at a temporal sceptre, our Lord declared that His Kingdom was not of this world.²³

Under no title, then, was our Lord, as Man, a temporal Prince over Judæa. Moreover, to Him royal power would have been not an aid, but a hindrance. For the end to attain which He came on earth, the redemption of mankind, supreme power was indeed needed, but spiritual and not temporal power. We must bear in mind, too, that by virtue of that spiritual power He possessed indirect jurisdiction over all things temporal to dispose of them as He knew best for spiritual purposes. Therefore temporal power would have been superfluous. Nay, it would have been positively harmful. It would have stood as a stumbling-block in the path of Christ's ascetic teaching. For our Lord both by example and word—since "He came to do and to teach,"²⁴ "not to be ministered unto, but to minister"²⁵—sought to lead men to despise wealth and position and honor and power and glory. Therefore with what playful sarcasm He questioned those who had gone out into the desert in quest of John the Baptist:²⁶ "What went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they that wear soft clothing are in the houses of Kings."

Christ neither exercised temporal and territorial sovereignty over Judæa nor possessed it. Theologians teach that He had neither the use nor the dominion. Bellarmine²⁷ writes: "Christ was in the fullest sense a poor man as regards both use and dominion." Nor is Suarez less emphatic:²⁸ "Christ assumed dominion neither over the whole world nor over any temporal kingdom . . . as His poverty evinces. For perfect evangelical poverty consists in the renunciation of all things temporal, as regards not only use, but also power and dominion over them."

David's temporal throne was, therefore, but a figure of Christ's spiritual throne. It follows, then, that as He had not territorial sovereignty Himself, so neither did He give it to Peter and his successors. For the Pope exercises that same visible office which Christ, as Man, exercised during His temporal life and before His Passion. The prerogatives of the Risen Christ, immortal and glorified, were not transmitted to Peter and the Roman Pontiffs. Peter and the Popes rule the Church as Christ ruled it before His crucifixion.

²³ Jo. xviii., 36. ²⁴ Acts i., 1. ²⁵ Mk. x., 45. ²⁶ Mt. xi., 18. ²⁷ op. cit. v., 4. ²⁸ "De Incar." xlviii., 2, 5.

I do not mean, of course, and the distinction is of supreme importance—that to Peter Christ, even as Man, communicated all His power. Theologians distinguish a three-fold dominion and jurisdiction—divine, human, *dei-virile*.²⁸ The first belongs to God as God; it is essentially independent and incommunicable, and Christ, as Man, was subject to it. The second belongs to man, as man; it is mainly founded on human suffrages; its end is to preserve the State in peace and concord. The third belongs to Christ as Man, but as Man substantially united to God; it is a function of the Man-God, and is styled the “dominion of excellence.” It stands midway between the divine and the human. It is inferior to the divine because it is subordinate to God. It is superior to the human, and that in at least three ways: in origin, coming directly from God and not from man; in stability, being eternal; in object, extending to all creation, natural and supernatural, men and angels. Hence every jot and tittle of that temporal sovereignty which Emperors and Kings possess, and incomparably more, Christ the Man-God wielded *eminenter*, not indirectly but directly, for the attainment not merely of spiritual but also of temporal ends. By this “dominion of excellence” Christ, as Man, by His own power and by virtue of His own authority, worked miracles, uttered prophecies, instituted sacraments, forgave sins without a sacrament.

Now of these three, Christ gave to Peter and the Popes neither divine dominion nor the “dominion of excellence,”²⁹ for they were not comunicable, nor yet human dominion, for it was not His to give. Nay, even their spiritual jurisdiction He restricted to the faithful: “Feed My sheep, feed My lambs.” Of that jurisdiction which can be conferred on a mere man and which was necessary for the government of Christians unto eternal life, He transferred to them only a part.

Hence St. Thomas writes:³⁰ “Theologians attribute to Christ a certain power possessed neither by Peter nor his successors. They call it the ‘power of excellence.’ Therefore the power of Peter and his successors does not equal Christ’s power. Nay, His power utterly exceeds theirs. For Christ could save without baptism. And consequently Jerome says that Christ cured no man’s body without at the same time curing his soul, and that without baptism. Yet Peter could not do as much, for even after the coming of the Holy Ghost he baptized with water Cornelius the Centurion and all his family. Christ, too, could change both form and matter of the sacraments, which Peter and his successors could not.”

The Popes have no divine right to the Roman States. This propo-

²⁸ Suarez, “De Incar.” xlviii., 2, 4. ²⁹ Suarez, “De Incar.” xlvii., 1, 4. ³⁰ “De Regimine Principum,” iii., 10.

sition I may now be allowed to support by authority. Bellarmine says emphatically: "The Pope has, directly and by divine right, no merely temporal jurisdiction."⁸¹

Nor is Suarez less explicit:⁸² "Christ gave no temporal dominion directly and immediately to the Roman Church; but what she actually possesses comes from the donation of Emperors and Kings." And again:⁸³ "By the title of *donation* only has the Pope direct temporal jurisdiction over the patrimony of St. Peter given by Constantine." And again:⁸⁴ "Christ neither instituted the Pope a sovereign prince nor commanded him to be so instituted."

In the following passage the mind of Suarez is made clear beyond all possibility of mistake:⁸⁵ "Christ did not *forbid* the Pope to be a temporal prince. For no such prohibition can be adduced. Nor is it essentially wrong for one and the same individual to be both Prince and Pastor. On the contrary—although too ample a temporal sway would not be in keeping with spiritual duties—nevertheless a moderately sized temporal principedom is not only permissible, it is even expedient for the maintenance of the Church's authority and splendor, to provide the necessary income, and for other similar purposes. Christ, therefore, did not prohibit a temporal sovereignty, but left it to human arrangement, regulated by right reason, and to the opportunities which time would offer."

The Temporal Power of the Popes over the Roman States is therefore *de jure humano* only.

I have labored rather to prove this conclusion, because it is of great importance, and it has been seriously controverted. At least two modern writers have made earnest, interesting and able attempts to prove a divine right for the Temporal Power. They have striven to adduce Scriptural warrant to show that it is *de jure divino positivo*, and therefore (I presume) that the denial of it would be formally heretical. I refer to the Hon. Colin Lindsay's learned work, "De Ecclesia et Cathedra; or, The Empire-Church of Jesus Christ," and to the Rev. C. F. P. Collingridge's careful thesis on "The Civil Principality of Christ."

Mr. Lindsay⁸⁶ writes: "It is *evident* then that the principle of the Temporal Power, long ago foretold by the prophets, would be continued in the Christian Dispensation, and that the place wherein it would be established was ancient and Imperial Rome, at that time the future metropolis and centre of Christendom."

And again:⁸⁷ "The principle of the Temporal Power is one originally ordained by God. . . . The Temporal Power has been established upon earth as a *divine* principle."

⁸¹ Op. cit. v., 4. ⁸² De Leg. iii., 2, 5. ⁸³ Cont. Sect. Angl. iii., 5, 13. ⁸⁴ Ibid, n. 19. ⁸⁵ Ibid, n. 19. ⁸⁶ P. 902. ⁸⁷ P. 918.

Father Collingridge,³⁸ after implying that the Temporal Power "is an *essential* part of the Divine Plan," writes: "I maintain that the Civil Principality or Temporal Princedom is a gift of Jesus Christ and a divine institution foreshadowed in the Old Testament and vindicated in the New." In other words, it is *de jure divino positivo*!

I am bound, however, to confess that Mr. Lindsay's argumentation seems to me, in large measure, fanciful, and that Father Collingridge deduces from his premises far more than they logically contain. I fail to see that either writer has proved more than the two conclusions which are common-places in theology, viz., that Christ possessed the "dominion of excellence" and that the Roman Pontiff is exempt from secular jurisdiction. Both authors assume that our Lord was, by divine right, a territorial King in Judæa, that He gave that right to Peter and the Popes, and that He transferred the seat of empire from Jerusalem to Rome. Father Collingridge³⁹ writes: "Jesus the Son of David was therefore the last bearer of the sceptre of Juda." It seems to me abundantly plain that He was not. Bel-larmine⁴⁰ says: "From *this false principle* that Christ, as Man, was a temporal King, two opposing errors have arisen," etc. Before Father Collingridge, Mr. Lindsay had written:⁴¹ "This principle of the Temporal Power was clearly and unequivocally established by God and that principle is indelible." Suarez, however, thought otherwise:⁴² "The Pope's temporal kingdom was founded, not immediately by God, but by the devotion of men, or by some other similar cause."

It might, perhaps, be objected that both Popes and theologians were for centuries mistaken in their contention that the Temporal Power was based, wholly or mainly, on the so-called Donation of Constantine. I think they were mistaken. But how does that vitiate their conclusion? They deny unanimously that the Temporal Power is *de jure divino*, whatever the precise title may be on which it is held; "*hominum devotione, vel alio simili humano titulo.*"⁴³

But may it not be argued that having proved Papal Exemption from secular jurisdiction to be *de jure divino*, it follows that the Popes, not being subjects, must, with equal right, be sovereigns? Is not every non-subject a sovereign? In a prefatory letter to Father Collingridge's booklet, Cardinal Vaughan seems to lend his weighty support to this opinion. His Eminence writes:⁴⁴ "The great theologian, Suarez, who speaks for the whole school, says that Christ declared Peter to be exempt from tribute, just as He Himself was, and that we are to understand that Christ granted this privilege

³⁸ P. 8. ³⁹ P. 27. ⁴⁰ Op. cit. v., 4. ⁴¹ P. 877. ⁴² "Contra Sect. Angl." iv., 4, 1. ⁴³ Suarez, l. c. ⁴⁴ P. 5.

of exemption to Peter because Peter was to be Prince and Head of the Church and the Vicar of Jesus Christ Himself. This privilege was, therefore, not personal to Peter, but real, and attached to the dignity and office which passes on to his successors in virtue of Divine power and of the peculiar institution and will of Christ. If tribute be the sign of temporal dependence and subjection, he who is not really subject to the payment of tribute is not really under temporal subjection."

Thus far His Eminence's argument is uncontrovertible. It is the same argument which has been sketched out in the preceding pages. It is the common opinion of theologians. Moreover, I have shown that Peter's non-subjection is undoubtedly *de jure divino*. But the letter then continues:

"The Pope is independent. If independent, he is sovereign. The principle of the temporal independence of the Pope appears to be contained in the text of the Gospel just referred to."

His Eminence's argument runs thus:

With what right a person is exempt from secular subjection, with that same right he is a secular sovereign.

But with divine positive right the Pope is so exempt.

Therefore with divine positive right the Pope is a secular sovereign.

I may remark that even thus the Cardinal's contention does not by any means reach the level at any rate of Mr. Lindsay's. The former draws the conclusion that the Pope is *de jure divino* a sovereign, but the latter that he is *the* sovereign of Rome.

I should like, if possible, to endorse the Cardinal's argument, but I must confess my inability to follow His Eminence's reasoning. With much mistrust of my own judgment, I venture to express a doubt as to the validity of the above syllogism. The minor is undeniably true; but can the major be proved? Is it evident that every non-subject is of necessity a sovereign? I think not. Not to go beyond the Scripture passage in question,⁴⁵ are not "the children of Kings" exempt from taxation and yet are they sovereign? Our Lord Himself was preëminently exempt, and yet He was not a sovereign. Is it therefore certain that the essentially non-subject Pope is also essentially a sovereign? Suppose the nations of Europe united (as they might) to guarantee the exemption and immunity of the present Prisoner of the Vatican, the Pope would be non-subject, but he would not be a sovereign.

Let us, however, examine the question on a lower ground. The Pope is *de jure divino positivo* non-subject; does it not logically follow that he is at least *de jure divino naturali* sovereign? Is not some

⁴⁵ Matt. xvii., 25.

sovereignty—if not sovereignty over Rome—a logical and necessary *deduction* from the Pope's non-subjection? Again I am constrained to answer in the negative.

But again it may be objected against me that not only is the deduction necessary, but that both the Papacy and the Episcopacy have repeatedly declared it to be necessary. Take two instances. In his Allocution of March 12, 1877, Pius IX. said: "In no way does the Roman Pontiff possess, nor can he ever possess, full liberty, or exercise his full authority, so long as he is subject to others ruling in his city. In Rome he must be either a sovereign or a captive."⁴⁶

And in his Letters of September 20, 1895, Leo XIII. wrote: "Nothing can ever confer true independence on the Papacy so long as it has no temporal jurisdiction."⁴⁷

Both Popes therefore maintain the *necessity* of temporal sovereignty.

I reply that they do not maintain it as a necessary *deduction* from exemption. They never claim that it is *de jure divino*. On the contrary they expressly refrain from that claim. The Temporal Power is, in these days, a *practical* necessity. For with all the facts clearly before them, the authorities have never affirmed more than this, that the Temporal Power came to the Holy See, "not as the effect of chance," but "by a peculiar design of Divine Providence," and "by a special disposition of God"—as Father Collingridge himself bears witness.⁴⁸ With all the data before them on which to base a sound judgment—for the present imbroglio is not new, since Rome has nine times already been captured by enemies—the authorities have ever advocated divine right of any kind for the Temporal Power. Neither in the Collections of the Councils, nor in the Bullarium, nor in the Acta Sanctæ Sedis, nor in the tomes of any father, doctor or theologian—so far as I am aware—is there on the one hand a single passage which maintains the divine right of the Temporal Principedom, while on the other hand there are scores of passages which explicitly affirm that right to be merely human.

However, let us look more closely into this most important question of the *necessity* of the Temporal Power. Is the Civil Principedom of the Popes really *necessary*? I reply that both from extrinsic authority and from intrinsic evidence we know for certain that it is.

Before, however, setting forth the rulings of ecclesiastical authority, I may first point out that this doctrine of *necessity* is not new. It was taught by the Holy See at least as far back as the thirteenth century. On August 4, 1278,⁴⁹ in the Encyclical Letter, *Fundamenta Militantis Ecclesiae*, addressed to the French Bishops, Pope

⁴⁶ "Acta Sanctæ Sedis," 1877, p. 57. ⁴⁷ "Acta S. Sedis," 1895, p. 200. ⁴⁸ P. 5.
⁴⁹ Bullarium Romanum, Mainard, Tom. III., pt. 2, p. 23.

Nicholas III. wrote: "That Holy Mother Church, in her pastoral care of the faithful, should not stand in need of temporal aids; nay, rather, in order that, helped by them, she might ever progress in spiritual growth; *not without a miracle* was the design conceived by Constantine of leaving the City of Rome to Pope Sylvester. . . . For Constantine deemed it unmeet that where the Heavenly King had established the High Priest and Head of the Christian Religion, there an earthly Emperor should hold sway. Nay, rather he held that Peter's See, now established on the throne of Rome, should possess full liberty in its action, nor be subject to any man, seeing that by divine choice (*aere divino*) it is known to have been set over all."

Of all arguments for the Temporal Power, the chief—at least for Catholics—is that from authority. For a Catholic the high road to certain truth in religion is not the beaten path of argument. His Church, with her supreme authority, must be to him the ultimate court of appeal. Such a one will look to the authoritative decisions of Popes or Councils, to the sense of the Church expounded by theologians, to the traditional view prevalent among pastors and people. And on this subject of the Temporal Power all these authorities are at one. Three quotations will set this assertion in a clear light.

Pius IX. in his Encyclical of 18 June, 1859, and addressed to all the Bishops of the Church, said: "We publicly proclaim that a Civil Princedom is necessary to this Holy See, that it may be able to exercise its sacred power without any impediment."

And again in Apostolic Letters of 16 March, 1860: "Since the Catholic Church, founded and instituted by Christ the Lord to procure the eternal salvation of men, has, by virtue of its divine institution, obtained the form of a perfect society, it ought consequently to possess such liberty that in the exercise of its sacred ministry it should be subject to no civil power. And because to act freely, it needed defenses corresponding to the condition and necessity of the times, therefore, by a *decidedly singular counsel* of Divine Providence, it happened that when the Roman Empire fell and was divided into several kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff, whom Christ has constituted the Head and Centre of His whole Church, acquired a Civil Princedom, whereby in truth it was most wisely provided by God Himself that, amidst such a multitude and variety of temporal Princes, the Sovereign Pontiff should enjoy that political liberty which is so *necessary* that he may exercise his spiritual power, authority and jurisdiction throughout the whole world, without any impediment."

Thirdly, the Bishops assembled in Rome in 1862 in an Address dated July 9 repeated this doctrine. That Address may be looked upon as coming from the whole episcopate, seeing that it was signed

by 265 Bishops in Rome, that many at a distance afterwards sent in their adhesion and that the Pope accepted and approved it. The document ran thus :

"We recognize the Civil Princedom of the Holy See as something *necessary* and manifestly instituted by God's Providence, nor do we hesitate to declare that in the present state of human things this Civil Princedom is altogether *required for the good and free government* of the Church. It was assuredly necessary that the Roman Pontiff should not be the subject, nay, not even the mere guest, of any Prince, but that, residing in a kingdom and dominion of his own, he should be his own master. . . . By all of us, therefore, it is to be held *as most certain* that this temporal rule did not fortuitously accrue to the Holy See, but by *a special disposition of God* was assigned to it, and during a long series of years confirmed and preserved to it, with the unanimous consent of all kingdoms and empires and *almost by a miracle*."⁵⁰

The summary of the doctrine laid down in these passages is this : First, that the Temporal Power was established and maintained by God through a special Providence ;⁵¹ secondly, that it has been beneficial ; thirdly, that it was, and still is, necessary for the Church ; fourthly, that its beneficial character and necessity continue to the present day ; and fifthly, that all this is most certain.

The Temporal Power, therefore, is undoubtedly, in some sense at least, necessary. But with what degree of necessity ? This necessity is one "corresponding to the condition and necessity of the times"—as Pius IX. expressed it, in the language of the Bishops—"in the present state of human things." It is a necessity, not absolute but relative, not essential but accidental. It is essential neither to the existence of the Church nor to the indispensable action of the Holy Father. That much seems plain from these two facts alone : First, that the Church existed in the Catacombs without any Temporal Power, either *de jure* or *de facto*, for some three centuries ; secondly, that she exists now without that power *de facto*. Moreover, it is clear that, by a change in His Providence, God could make the Church flourish more without than she ever flourished with her civil sovereignty.

The Temporal Power, therefore, is necessary to the Church ; not to her *esse*, but her *bene esse* ; not to her being, but her well-being.

But to what degree of well-being ? Well-being is an elastic term and admits of a very considerable latitude of interpretation. For example, is a mechanic in a state of well-being with thirty shillings a

⁵⁰ Quoted in extenso by Father Collingridge, p. 70. ⁵¹ By "Providence" is understood that care which God takes of His creatures both in the natural and supernatural orders. It is the natural or supernatural *provision* which He makes for them.

week? Or a County Court Judge with thirty pounds? Or the Archbishop of Canterbury with three hundred pounds? Or a merchant prince with three thousand pounds? If these are all cases of well-being—as they seem to be—they are certainly not the same well-being. Then for what *degree* of well-being is the Temporal Power *necessary* to the Church? I think I am safe in saying that the authorities quoted understand a well-being that is not superlative, not superfluous; not a well-being of extreme prosperity, but a well-being such as is reasonably due to the Church, such as is in keeping with her state, such that without it she would be hampered and embarrassed, such that if it were lost permanently she would be in a state, not indeed of ruin but of want, not of collapse but of distress.

That answer, however, does not quite solve the problem. For what is a due well-being? Protestants think the Church has a due well-being now; Catholics are sure she has not. Who is to define what is fit and becoming as regards her well-being? A somewhat similar difficulty confronted Aristotle in his definition of "Virtue." According to him, virtue stands in the mean.⁵² But what is the mean? Neither excess nor defect. But what is excess and what is defect? If a rich Duke gives a half-penny for the Westminster Cathedral, and the poor widow in the Gospel gives to the Temple two mites, which make a farthing,⁵³ would the Duke be twice as generous as the widow? No, for the mean is not absolute, but relative—relative to the individual. Well, then, what donation would be generous in a Duke? For if the mean is relative, who is to define it? Aristotle replies: "Defined by reason." Yes, but whose reason? The miser's or the spendthrift's, Shylock's or Antonio's? Aristotle again answers and finally: "As the *prudent* man would define it." Who, then, are the "prudent men" fit to define what is necessary to the due well-being of the Church? The Pope and Bishops.

I have said that the Temporal Power is so necessary to the Church that without it she would be straitened, but not starved. It is necessary for the modest competence of the Church. And in thus saying I mean, not the Church of the Catacombs before she reached her adult stature, but as she is now, in her normal condition, widespread, full-grown, mature. Moreover, I mean the Church in her permanent condition and not in a state of passing trials and occasional disturbances.

But another obscurity presents itself. This well-being, defined as necessary by the "prudent," is it that moderate well-being which duly befits the Church, or is a minimum rigidly due to the Church? Is it only that which ought to be there, or is it that which must be

⁵² *Ethics*, B. 2, c. 6, n. 10. ⁵³ *Mk.* xii., 42.

there and which God has promised shall be there? Unless He found a substitute for the Temporal Power, God of course could not positively will its final extinction; but could He permit it? Would such permission invalidate His promises? Has God guaranteed that it shall not become finally extinct? If He has, then He will restore it. If He has, then the Papal and episcopal declarations of necessity imply that the final abolition of the Temporal Power is a moral impossibility and that God is bound to and therefore will reestablish it.

I must, however, confess that a degree of necessity so high as that seems to me theologically incapable of demonstration. I hope the Temporal Power will be restored. I hold, personally, arguing from past historical analogies and from present political embarrassments, that it will be restored. But that such restoration is certain, that divine guarantees make it certain, that Pope and Bishops implicitly declare it to be certain—where is the proof? Christ said:⁵⁴ "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" And in like manner we may ask: "Shall He find His Church in possession of her Temporal Power?" Who knows?⁵⁵

Next, if we pass from the declarations of authority to the dictates of reason, it is not hard to assign grounds for the necessity of the Pope's civil sovereignty. Those grounds I propose to explain at length in another article, but they are summed up in the sentence of Pius IX.: "That the Holy See may be able to exercise its sacred power without any impediment." In a word, these are the main reasons: To secure freedom from secular dictation; to possess ability to carry on, without let or hindrance, the world-wide government of the Church; to enjoy the possession of competent revenues for that purpose; to wield the power necessary to uphold the dignity and even the splendor of the Pope's unique position.

Let us next ask what precise obligation lies on Catholics to accept this teaching? How far is a Catholic bound to recognize the necessity of the Temporal Sovereignty? Is that necessity a mere opinion? Is it a dogma of the faith? Or is it a doctrine intermediate between mere opinion and absolute dogma? In view of the loose views prevalent on this subject, this question calls for a clear reply.

Would a denial of the necessity of the Temporal Power be heresy? For those writers who think the Temporal Power to be of positive divine right—"clearly, evidently and unequivocally," as Mr. Lindsay holds—and writ plain in Scripture, perhaps it would.

⁵⁴ Lk. xviii., 8. ⁵⁵ On this subject there is a curious speculation in Suarez, "Contra Sect. Angl.," v. 7, 9 and 11, that Rome will perhaps some day be destroyed, its buildings uprooted and the whole city burned to the ground and blotted out. Nor does he think that such an event would run counter to the divine promises in behalf of the Church, since Peter's See shall never fail whether it be set up in this place or that, whether the Church remain visible or be driven by persecution to fly to the mountains or to hide in secret holes. As the Church began in the Catacombs, he thinks it not improbable that she may end in them.

Again, for those who hold it to be a natural divine right, the denial might be heretical.

But, as I have said before, I doubt if there be reasonable grounds—I am sure there is no obligation—to hold either of these superlative opinions. No one is *bound* to believe that the Temporal Power is based on anything higher than human right, though he must hold that a special Providence guided men to confer that right.

This then is the practical question: What is the obligation to submit, founded on the plain, repeated and authoritative teaching of the Papacy and the Episcopacy? That question I shall now strive to answer.

In a letter of His Eminence Cardinal Prosper Caterini, Prefect of the S. Congregation of the Council of Trent, and written by command and under the direction of Pius IX., after granting that “the matter in question does not *directly* concern the faith,” the writer says:⁶⁶ “To assert that the doctrine as to the necessity and fitness of the Civil Princedom of the Holy See is a novelty of but recent introduction is historically false and *doctrinally erroneous*. It is equivalent to attributing error and usurpation to the Popes who have received and maintained their temporal sovereignty over the States of the Church and to gainsaying the two celebrated Councils of Lyons and Constance, which both, by word and deed, have sanctioned this Temporal Princedom. To assert the contrary would be to renew the error of Arnold of Brescia, Calvin and other heretics, who in their hostility to the Church and the See of Rome taught that it was foreign to the spirit of the Gospel to conjoin spiritual jurisdiction with civil power—a proposition deservedly branded as *heretical*.”

According to Caterini, therefore, to call the necessity of the Temporal Power a novelty is doctrinally erroneous and “equivalent” to heresy.

A practical test of the Church’s mind on this subject is supplied by the fact that when in 1877 Father Curci, S. J.—one of the most distinguished men of his order—held and taught the non-necessity of the Temporal Power, he was called upon to recant and, refusing, was expelled from the Society of Jesus, of which for forty years he had been so bright an ornament.

Moreover, the Syllabus of Pius IX. contains two condemned propositions touching the Civil Princedom which throw a very clear light on the obligations of Catholics. One denies the necessity of the Temporal Power; the other affirms its extinction to be beneficial. But before citing them verbatim I may be allowed to preface their quotation with a few words of explanation.

The Syllabus was published as an appendix to the Encyclical

⁶⁶ The letter is printed in the *Month*, February, 1869, p. 195.

"*Quanta Cura*," of December 8, 1864, and is a catalogue of propositions enunciating the principal errors of the day, all of which had been already condemned before the Syllabus appeared.⁵⁷ The censure under which each proposition is branded is not affixed in the Syllabus, and to discover what the particular note of condemnation is recourse must be had to the original Papal document in which each error was originally stigmatized. It is certain, however, that not all were condemned as heretical. Some of them evidently deserve a minor censure, such as "false" or "erroneous" or "rash" or "impious" or "dangerous" or "scandalous." Again, it is certain that many, at least, of the condemnations are not "doctrinal Pontifical definitions, not ex-cathedral judgments." Fessler⁵⁸ expressly teaches this: "It is certain that several of the documents containing these condemnations and from which the proscribed propositions are drawn, do not contain Papal definitions or ex-cathedral judgments."

There is, however, a further question. When Pius IX., in the Syllabus, renewed the condemnation of these proscribed propositions *in globo*, did he raise the original censures to the dignity of definitions of faith? It cannot be proved that he did. To quote Fessler again:⁵⁹ "Did the Pope, from the fact of his sending the Syllabus to the whole episcopate, mean to raise the censures passed by him to the dignity of definitions of faith, such as, according to the dogmatic decision of the Vatican Council, would constitute a formal judgment *ex-cathedra*? That is a question about which many theologians think it permissible to raise a doubt, until at any rate there comes a new declaration from the Holy See."

The two condemned propositions concerning the Temporal Power are, therefore, not heretical. They are, however, "false and perverse opinions." For in the concluding sentence of the *Quanta Cura*⁶⁰ all the propositions of the Syllabus are collectively proscribed and condemned as, at least, "false and perverse opinions and to be so proscribed and condemned by all true children of the Catholic Church." Moreover, in the Syllabus itself, in a note appended to the two condemned propositions in question, it is laid down that the contradictions of these are to be most firmly held by all Catholics.⁶¹

But, it may be asked, are Catholics bound to accept anything more than the dogmas of the Church? To that question Pius IX. returned an emphatic answer in the Brief *Tuas Libenter*, addressed to the Archbishop of Munich December 21, 1863: "It is not enough to venerate and receive the dogmas of the Church. It is further necessary to submit to the doctrinal decisions of the Pontifical Congrega-

⁵⁷ Cf. Hergenröther, "Church and State," Essay V. ⁵⁸ "True and False Infallibility," French Trans., p. 133. ⁵⁹ P. 134. ⁶⁰ Denzinger, "Enchiridion," n. 1,547. ⁶¹ Denzinger, n. 1,625.

tions, as also to those heads of doctrine which by the common and constant consent of Catholics are held as theological truths and as conclusions so certain that though the opposite opinion cannot be called heretical, nevertheless it deserves some other theological censure."⁶²

But might not an opponent argue that though the two propositions in question have undoubtedly been condemned as false and perverse opinions, and though the Pope has declared that Catholics are bound so to hold them, yet that neither condemnation nor declaration need be taken to bind under a grave obligation? For is it an infallible declaration that these two propositions are false and perverse opinions? If the proscribed propositions themselves are not heretical, but only false, would it be heretical to deny that they are false? Is the Syllabus infallible? I reply that the Syllabus cannot be proved to be infallible, nevertheless that it binds under a grave obligation. Hence Christian Pesch, S. J., writes:⁶³ "Although some have doubted whether the Syllabus be a formal ex-cathedral definition, still the propositions whereof the Syllabus is an authoritative catalogue have been condemned by the Pope in such a way as to show that he intended to bind the Universal Church to reject them. This, too, is proved by the unanimous consent of the Catholic Episcopate, since no Catholic is now allowed to defend these proscribed propositions. But what note must be affixed on individual propositions, and with what degree of assent the opposite doctrines must be held is to be gathered partly from the documents out of which the propositions have been culled, partly from the subject matter."

Therefore the Syllabus, if not formally, is at any rate practically infallible. For it is the common teaching of theologians that the Church is substantially infallible in branding false doctrines, whatever be the note with which she may proscribe them. De Lugo writes:⁶⁴ "Theologians commonly admit that the Church's judgment in affixing these minor censures is certain. To say that the Church can err in this judgment is an error, or is allied to error. To persist in saying it Malder holds to be heretical. To say that the Supreme Pontiff can err in decreeing these censures Turrian stigmatizes as an error, while I think it to be erroneous or proximate to error, since the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to the Church should not, I think, be limited to dogmas proposed as *de fide*, but it ought to extend to all those subjects which the faithful at the bidding of the Church are bound to believe."

The obligation, then, is grave. But to what sort of an assent is it an obligation—internal or only external? Is it only an obligation to

⁶² Denzinger, n. 1,537. ⁶³ "Institutiones Propædænticae," Vol. I., n. 520.
⁶⁴ "De Virtute Fidei Divinae," D. 20, sec. 3, nn. 108, 109.

observe a decorous silence? That question hardly merits a reply. However, the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* puts the matter beyond dispute. Pius IX. wrote:⁶⁵ "We cannot pass over in silence the foolhardiness of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, maintain that it is possible, without sin and without any detriment to the Catholic profession, to withhold assent and obedience to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See the object of which is declared to refer to the Church's general good, her rights and her discipline. How profoundly opposed this opinion is to the Catholic dogma of the plenitude of power in the Roman Pontiff, divinely conferred on him by Christ Himself, of feeding, ruling and governing the Universal Church, any one in his senses can understand."

The Pope says "assent and obedience." Had he said "obedience" alone a strained construction might have limited it to merely external acts. But he adds also "assent," which can only refer to internal conformity both of intellect and of will. The Holy Father's teaching is then clear that we cannot without sin, and without grave sin—that is, without detriment to our Catholic profession—withhold internal assent to the converse of these condemned propositions.

With that preamble I now proceed to quote the proscribed propositions in question. The former affirms the *necessity* of the Temporal Power to be doubtful: "The children of the Christian and Catholic Church are not at one (*disputant*) as to the compatibility of the Temporal and Spiritual Powers."

The latter goes further and affirms not only that the Temporal Power is not necessary, but that its abolition would be *beneficial*: "The abolition of the Temporal Power, whereof the Apostolic See is possessed, would greatly contribute to the Church's liberty and prosperity."⁶⁶

I quoted above Caterini's judgment, endorsed by Pius IX., that to hold these branded propositions was "doctrinally erroneous and equivalent to heresy." I end by quoting a similar criticism on the same propositions, passed by one whose theological erudition and well-balanced judgment have hardly been surpassed in our generation. I refer to Father Edmund J. O'Reilly, S. J., some time professor of theology, first at Maynooth, then at St. Beuno's, North Wales, and finally in the Catholic University of Ireland. In his book, "The Relations of the Church to Society,"⁶⁷ he writes about these propositions: "The question, therefore, is *not* debated among sound Catholics. Indeed, I look upon the condemnation of the Pope's Temporal Power as *constructive heresy*. For if the Temporal Power is wrong, the Church, too, is wrong in a way in which our faith forbids us to admit she can be wrong." And in a masterly

⁶⁵ Denzinger, n. 1,547. ⁶⁶ Denzinger, nn. 1624, 1625 ⁶⁷ P. 345.

article in the *Month*⁶⁶ the same theologian writes even more sternly: "What is to be thought of those professing Catholics who pretend that the extinction of the Temporal Power would be beneficial to the Church? Taking into account the Papal and Episcopal declarations, and at the same time the action of the Popes, and the sense of the Church manifested in many ways for ages, I cannot bring myself to believe that such a view falls short of *heresy, at least of constructive heresy*. I do not want to imply that it is contradictorily opposed to a dogmatic definition on the utility of the Temporal Power, but that it obviously charges the Church with a very serious error, doctrinal and practical; for if that condemned view be right, the Church is grievously and mischievously mistaken concerning her own condition, and has been so for ages. And such an imputation cannot be cleared of heresy."

Our obligations in regard to the Temporal Power are, therefore, very grave; much graver indeed than many Catholics seem to realize.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

Stoneyhurst, Engl. nd.

FROM SILVIO PELLICO TO FRANCESCO CRISPI.

LITERATURE stands at one end of the chain of Italian Revolution, License at the other. Both were well personified, the one in the gentle prisoner of the *piombi*, and the other in the wrecker of the Roman Bank. In the same sense that the poet makes Hamlet bitterly cry, "Frailty, thy name is Woman," it may be truly said of the demagogic ideal, "Liberty, thy name is Avernus." Once embarked on that fatal slope, there is no halting until the depths where ruin lurks are touched. There can hardly be a doubt that the writings of Silvio Pellico were the means which won that intense outside sympathy with Italian conspiracy without which it could hardly have achieved the ambiguous success it did. A very large number of persons, well-meaning and influential, in England as well as on the continent of Europe, and not a few in the United States, were greatly moved at the recital of prison sufferings in Italy. And, while this fact is creditable to the humanity of such sentimentalists, it must not be suffered to obscure the moral of the episode that in the several countries wherein those philanthropists shed the gentle ray of their influence on human progress, there existed, in Silvio

⁶⁶ September, 1871, p. 186.

Pellico's day, and for many years afterward, prison systems no less revolting to the sense of humanity than those depicted with such graphic force by the poetic Italian revolutionist.

It was in Great Britain that the Italian Revolution found its largest number of sympathizers, and it is a very suggestive fact that Great Britain is the only one of the civilized powers which draws now no distinction between political prisoners and ordinary criminals. Much sympathy found expression in the United States also, and it is therefore useful to recall what Dickens said of the American penitentiary system about the same period as witnessed the beginnings of the Italian Revolution. One of its most terrible results was the alarming increase of insanity among the convicts.

No doubt there were many really philanthropic persons in the ranks of those who denounced Neapolitan and Venetian and Austrian methods of rule and prison treatment, as well here as in Great Britain, at that particular epoch. But in their enthusiasm these for the most part overlooked the fact that in Ireland, on the one part, there was then actually existent a state of things, politically and socially, absolutely without parallel, for bungling despotism and acute physical suffering spread over wide areas, in any part of the globe; and on the other that the system of Negro slavery was one of the institutions of the land. Therefore, it required the hardihood of guileless unconsciousness for any one, even a statesman of Mr. Gladstone's rank and character, to advert to any political or social system, outside Ireland and the British prison system, as a "negation of God."

Yet it was by means of the feeling begotten of such appeals that the Italian Revolution was nursed, from infancy to maturity. So incessantly did Italian writers like Azeglio and Guerazzi din the enormities of Bourbon and Papal rule into the ear of Europe, that numerous deluded sympathizers became firmly persuaded that the picture had no side but the sable one, and that the men who were banded together for the overthrow of Bourbon and Papal rule were patriots of the purest type, who sought to accomplish their ends by purely legitimate means. Of course Englishmen like Palmerston and Stansfeld, who had traveled in Italy, knew better. They were fully aware that all the most dangerous elements in Italian life were engaged in the general insurrectionary movement. They knew Mazzini and the doctrine he preached; they knew the Carbonari and its constituent elements; they knew the Mafia and Camorra—and knowing all these fearful resources of Revolution, and the predominant power they held in its counsels, they yet did not hesitate to render to the cause all the aid and comfort they were capable of bringing, directly and indirectly.

In framing a bill of indictment against the Papacy not the least scruple was shown about laying at its door the sins of its neighbors. Austrian repression in the Quadrilateral and Venetia, and the tyranny of the Bourbons in the Two Sicilies, the misrule of the Duchies of Tuscany, Parma and Modena—all these were named, habitually, in the same breath with the rule in the States of the Church, and all anathematized indiscriminatingly by British and other sympathizers with the Revolution.

Somehow it appears to have been altogether overlooked by at least British sympathizers with the Italian Revolution that the responsibility for Italian turmoil lay, not at the door of the Pope, but at that of the great powers of Europe. After the overthrow of Napoleon these irresponsible parties, through their representatives assembled in Vienna, proceeded to knock to pieces the Kingdom of Italy as constituted by the Corsican conqueror, and make a new arrangement of the Italian map. The best way to appease the revolutionary spirit which was then seething in every former principality of the peninsula, it appeared to these pseudo Solomons, was to restore the status quo before Bonaparte, and divide the country up nearly as it was in the days when every principality and every republic was in a state of chronic or intermittent war with its neighbor. The King of Sardinia, an irreclaimable plotter against the peace of Italy, was recalled, and had Genoa added to his dominions, with the same vain hope of appeasing his land-hunger as when a bone is thrown to a wolf. The Bourbons were restored to the kingdom whence they were ousted by Murat; Austria grabbed at Lombardy and Venetia for herself, and the duchies were rehabilitated much in their old shape. Such measures were thought likely to satisfy the aspirations of the various revolutionists, whose unrest was thought to be provincial rather than national. These petty governments found it necessary to begin their new career with a system of repression more rigorous than that of Bonaparte, and the usual result ensued. The numbers and modes of conspiracy became multiplied; clever manipulators like Mazzini went about sowing the seed of the dragon; more coercion was applied by the stupid rulers, and the attention of the world was called to the miserable scene by the writings of men like Silvio Pellico and Guerazzi.

The part which England—or at least many leading Englishmen—took in the campaign of calumny which resulted from this propaganda is especially discreditable because all Europe knew at that time that the gentle Pope, Pius VII., was persecuted by Napoleon, whose prisoner he was, chiefly because of the firm attitude he maintained toward his design to promote a continental league against Great Britain. The Sovereign Pontiff, as spiritual father of all

nations, could not declare war against any of his family, and Napoleon's proposal virtually involved such action. If the common herd were not all aware of this, statesmen and scholars and public men, such as moulded public opinion either by their writings or public addresses, were well aware of it; and yet many such responsible persons were found at the head of the agitation whose central object was the hounding of the Papacy and the destruction of its temporal rule. Well they knew, these English public men, that political assassination was one of the means looked to by the Italian associations for the regeneration of Italy. Palmerston was aware of it—and he was at the head of the Government; Gladstone was aware of it, and he, too, was in the Government; Stansfeld, Roebuck and several others prominent in Parliamentary life, hesitated not to countenance principles so dramatically denounced by Edmund Burke when a preceding Revolution had startled the world by the enunciation of a new and monstrous doctrine in political development. Eminent men of letters began seriously to discuss the morality of murder for the public weal. In his young days Mr. Gladstone had written some worthless verses in praise of "the valiant and the good" who in their time had "clove a priest or peer in twain;" and the inclusion of the priest in the class whose fitting meed was the assassin's blow gave particular point to the circumstances of the agitation of those days. Walter Savage Landor lent all the verve and picturesqueness of an unusually fertile fancy to a glorification of the bloodbond for the removal of adversaries who might be dubbed tyrants. It may be well to reproduce some of his ardent sentences, as an example of the vein of thought running at that epoch through the British mind, and finding expression even in such staid newspapers as the *Times*. Landor write, *inter alia*:

"Public wrongs may and ought to be punished by private vindication, where the tongue of law is paralyzed by the bane of despotism; and the action which in civil life is the worst becomes, where civism lies beneath power, the most illustrious that magnanimity can achieve. The calmest and wisest men that ever lived were unanimous in this sentence; it is sanctioned by the laws of Solon, and sustained by the authority of Cicero and Aristoteles. . . . Teachers, the timid and secluded, point it out to youth among a thousand pages; colleges ring with it, over chants and homilies; piety closes her thumbed lesson, and articulates less tremulously this response. The street cries 'Cæsar,' the study whispers 'Brutus.' Degenerate men have never been so degenerate, the earth is not yet so effete, as not to rear up one imitator of one great deed. Glory to him!—peace, prosperity, long life and like descendants! Remember, brave soul, this blow fixes thy name above thy contemporaries.

VOL. XXVI—12.

Doubt not, it will have its guard to stand under it, and fill the lamp that shows thy effigy."

While the poet was thus weaving the laurel wreath for the dagger of Harmodius, the prose writer was pointing out that the time for using it had come. "Liberty," wrote the *Times*, "is to be fought for, not with fine speeches, but with knives and hatchets."

That it was not really liberty which those British dwellers in glass houses were enamored of, but a blind hatred of Pope and Papacy, is easily apparent from many passages in the higher literature of the period. Here is a specimen taken at random. It is from the *North British Review*, a shining Scottish searchlight, for May and August, 1853:

"Italia, O Italia, how long shall thy harp hang on the willows? How long instead of retaining such men as these" (anonymous conspirators) "within thy bosom, to make thee what thou mightst become, shalt thou have to drive them forth as now to show what that might be? Arise, thou noble land; arise in thy strength to right thine own wrongs, and, while righting these, to render at the same time that service to the world which the world expects from thee. Destroy that Nuisance crowned with a tiara which not thou alone but a whole earth is tired of; crush, crush that Spider of the nations whose home-nest is in thee, but whose web overspreads the world! Arise, and take thy place among the nations, O fair Italy; do among them as thou hast capacity and will; and be estimated according to thy deserts!"

If we would get the just historical perspective in our survey of sequential things, we must study for a little the background against which the figure of Francesco Crispi, the greatest statesman of "United Italy," was first projected on the political stage. He was the last of the quartette of sinister renown whose names are sculptured on the blood-red granite pillar that marks its rise on the field of history. In himself he comprised in a singular degree all the different qualities of the other three. He was a mixture of the statesman Cavour, in his profound dissembling mind; the wily conspirator Mazzini, in his readiness to adapt himself to any and every condition to gain his ends; of the impetuous and sensual Garibaldi, in his proneness to get into a fight for fighting's sake; and whatever the others lacked in downright rascality and hardihood in brazening it out on discovery was more than made up in him.

This is not our verdict upon the departed revolutionist. It is the exegesis of the various pronouncements on his career by the leading public journals of Europe. To an unholy cause he brought the service of an unholy life.

From Silvio Pellico to Francesco Crispi is a descent indeed. The

prisoner of the Austrians was no less sincere in his religion than in his patriotism. Even in his hours of greatest mental and physical anguish, as he lay helpless in his dungeon, the faith in which he had been nurtured stood firm. Those who have read his prison life will recall with what indignation he speaks of one who had wormed himself into his confidence by means of letters smuggled through a friendly jailor, and at last disclosed his intention to convert him to his own base atheism. From that moment the friendship was rejected, and the poet prisoner was content with his solitude, preferring it to contact with a designing tempter. His mind on this point speaks clearly and nobly in his tragedy of *Gismonda da Mendrisio*, wherein he makes one of the characters (Ermano) say, in answer to one who would ensnare him into treacherous action :

The high deeds of war
Are virtuous only when the cause is so.
In him who is the champion of treason
I hate, I brand them with the name of crimes.

What a delightful glimpse of character is afforded in Pellico's chapters on the deaf and dumb boy whom he found in the prison of St. Marguerite! It reads like a sweet idyll, composed in a sylvan dell or noble forest, rather than the reflections of a man cooped up in a gloomy fortress, with no prospect before his eyes but the forbidding quadrangle of the courtyard. The poor mute's affections were easily gained. Pellico shared his bread with him, and the poor child, unaccustomed to kindness—for he was a mere waif, an outcast—at once turned to his new-found friend with all the prodigal affection of a canine for his master. "Though expecting nothing from me," he says, "he would continue to gambol beneath my window, and with the most amiable grace, delighted that I should see him. One day a turnkey promised that he should be allowed to visit me in my cell; the moment he entered he ran to embrace my knees with a cry of joy. I took him in my arms, and the transports with which he caressed me are indescribable. What attachment there was in this poor creature! How I longed to educate him, to save him from the abject condition in which I found him! I never learned his name. He himself did not know that he had one. He was always gay, and never did I see him weep but once, when he was beaten, I know not for what, by the gaoler. To live in a prison seems the height of misfortune, and yet assuredly this child was then as happy as the son of a prince. I reflected on this; I learned that it is possible to render the mind independent of place. Let us keep the imagination in subjection, and we shall be well everywhere."

What a touching example of the philosophy which wrote

Stone walls do not a prison make,
Nor iron bars a cage.
Minds innocent and quiet take
These for a hermitage.

This ray of light in the two poor prisoners' lives was soon shut off. Pellico was transferred to another room, where he could see nothing, only a corner of the courtyard, and he never learned the fate of his affectionate little protégé. We can readily imagine what anguish must have torn that tender little heart at this cruel separation. Hardly more tragically pathetic is the story of Ugolino and his children in the tower than this glimpse of prison life in St. Marguerite.

The deeply religious tone of Pellico's life is further revealed in what he goes on to tell of the succeeding days. Shut off from the sight of all things outside, he was happily afforded some distraction for his mind in the sharpness of his sense of hearing. The portion of the prison set apart for female offenders was nigh, and he could hear the women talking, scolding, laughing and, sometimes, singing. He tells us that amongst those voices there was one that especially attracted him by the sweetness of its quality, and the favorite refrain of the singer :

Che rende alla meschina
La sua felicità?

Often the others joined in the refrain, and sometimes all sang the Litany. Pellico told of the delight with which he listened to this girl's warbling, and how without seeing the owner of the voice he had come to form an attachment for her. He was destined never to behold her, for he was soon afterwards taken to Venice, to be lodged in the terrible quarters known as the *piombi*.

In his earlier years Pellico had been careless about religion, but immediately after his imprisonment began his thoughts instinctively turned toward the lessons he had learned in his childhood. When he thought of his parents and the anguish they must feel over his incarceration, he consoled himself, he tells us, by thinking of the overruling God and the comfort which stricken hearts derive by appealing to His mercy. Rigorous though his detention was, his jailors still allowed him the use of two books—the Bible and Dante. While the latter afforded him much intellectual pleasure at first, the constant repetition of its lines, which he had soon committed completely to memory, began in time to make the work pall upon him. Not so, however, with the inspired volume. He began to meditate upon its eternal truths with greater intent than ever; its salutary mandates and maxims began to impress themselves with irresistible force upon his memory. The wholesome precept, "Pray without ceasing," in especial, commended itself so to his understanding that by its help he gradually grew accustomed to the consciousness of an ever-present Deity, and to conform all his thoughts to the Divine will, in so far as he was enabled to realize what its direction

was. This habit grew upon him so that he could not emancipate himself from it, even if he so desired. It superinduced a tranquillity of spirit, a gentleness of thought, a mansuetude and a magnanimity which seemed hardly short of saintly, and which, glowing through his pages, impress all readers with the idea of a truly noble being, elevating suffering into dignity and suffusing even a dungeon with the softened brilliancy of genius devoted to the service of humanity.

Such was Silvio Pellico: a man never moulded for a conspirator, yet drawn into the fatal whirlpool of conspiracy by an irresistible influence, at a time when conspiracy was epidemic. The exact antithesis of this gentle rebel was the man who, hoary but not venerable, was borne to his grave a little while ago.

If ever there lived an individual who could be described as embodying two different persons in the one psychology, the man Francesco Crispi was surely he. Although Palermo was his birth-place, he was of Albanian blood—an evil strain, for the Albanians are the descendants of renegade Christians, who, to save their lives or lands, renounced their religion and adopted that of their Moslem conquerors, and so brought disgrace upon the country of Scanderbeg and his gallant compatriots. Renegades though they be, the Albanians are valiant to ferocity, and this quality was possessed by Crispi in its intensest shape. To this high physical courage he united all that Sicilian cunning which makes the secret bond of the Mafia an *imperium in imperio* which no earthly power seems capable of suppressing or destroying. The Mafia was long in existence when Crispi began his career in Palermo, and it is there still. It is extremely probable that Crispi was, in his teens, a prominent member of this peculiar organization. The origin of the Mafia is obscure, but in all probability it was the result of the successive invasions by which Sicily was scourged, ever since the dawn of history—since it is a well-known law in human nature that deceit and lying, the only alternatives left to people between two fires, so to speak—between the fury of the invaders and the vengeance of their own fellows if they aid them—become part and parcel of the mental fibre and a hereditament that no moral training may entirely overcome. Mr. F. Marion Crawford, in his work entitled “The Rulers of the South,” presents us with a good picture of what a gentleman of the Mafia looks like and represents. He quotes from the report of Signor Antonio Cutrera, the chief of police in the city of Palermo. He is describing a low Mafusian:

“He wears his hat upon the left side, his hair smoothed with plentiful pomatum and one lock brushed down upon his forehead; he walks with a swinging motion of the hips, a cigar in his mouth, a

heavy knotted stick in his hand, and he is frequently armed with a long knife or revolver. He stares disdainfully at every man he meets with the air of challenging every comer if he dare. To any one who knows Palermo this type of the lower class is familiar. He is the common 'Riccotaro,' a word which I will not translate, but which broadly indicates that the young man derives his means of support from some unfortunate woman who is in his power. It is a deplorable fact that the same mode of existence is followed by young men of the middle classes, whose plentiful leisure hours are spent in play, and who have constituted themselves the official clique of the theatres, imposing themselves upon the managers as a compact body. Moreover, during elections they can be of the utmost assistance to candidates, owing to their perfect solidarity. With the most atrocious vices they possess the hereditary courage of the Sicilian, and will face steel or bullets with the coolness of trained soldiers; and though they will insult and even beat their women when in the humor, they will draw the knife for the least disparaging word spoken against what they regard as their property."

Palermo is the chief home of the Mafia. It is impossible to say whether Francesco Crispi was really initiated into this terrible cult or not. But, from the universality of the system, and the impossibility of any one getting along in the world without its influence, as in American cities where the "machine" is indispensable in political life, it is extremely probable that he was an influential member of it—a capo-Mafia in a short time—that is, an acknowledged leader. Although he was brought up to the profession of the law, he may still have been a member, for, as Signor Cutrera says, "the capo-Mafia may be a lawyer and a member of the municipal or even the provincial council, or a deputy, or a cabinet minister, rising to the moral control of the whole society simply by his prestige and predominant will." We might almost think that this shrewd police official actually had Francesco Crispi in his mind's eye when penning this sketch of the Mafia organization, since if ever there was a man who possessed a predominant will, and soon, by means of it, acquired prestige and power over his fellows, Crispi was his name. It is, therefore, almost morally certain that he was a member of the Mafia, and there is no doubt whatever that he belonged to the still more formidable society of the Carbonari. The year of revolutions, 1848, found him at the head of an insurrection in Palermo, and after a period of anarchy called republican government, in which many respectable men were put to death by the mob, he is found in flight from the city, in common with other ringleaders, and a wandering outcast in several European cities. Like many other penniless

patriots he turned at last toward Turin, then the capital of the peripatetic government of Savoy, but he found little opening for his talents there. He belonged to the party of Mazzini, and as Cavour, who found it politic to disavow Mazzini and his methods, was firmly in power there, Francesco Crispi had no chance of a political job. Neither could he find any employment as a lawyer, for the market was glutted with the briefless ones. He was in sore straits—so sore, indeed, that he applied for a very modest post, a mere village berth as town clerk, at a salary of a hundred and forty dollars a year, and did not even get it. As there was nothing but starvation facing him in Piedmont, Crispi shook the dust of the country from his sandals and hied him off secretly, somehow, back to Sicily. There he again began the work of conspiracy, in agreement with Garibaldi, with whom he had formed a political connection. All the plans having been carefully laid, Garibaldi, in company with Bixio, Turr and other officers, and with the connivance of the Turin Government, it would seem, set out to attack Sicily. The expedition must certainly have been a failure were it not for the resources in villainy possessed by Crispi and Turr. The former forged a telegram which was sent on to Garibaldi, purporting to emanate from political leaders in Sicily, and announcing that all was in readiness for an uprising in the provinces as well as Palermo; whereas the fact was the very reverse, and Crispi saw that all must be lost unless Garibaldi and his filibusters appeared on the scene in a position to fight. Turr's duplicity was equally daring. He himself afterwards told it to Mr. Haweis. When Garibaldi was about to start he found to his dismay that supplies of ammunition which had been promised him by the government had not come. In this strait he sent General Turr to the commandant of the arsenal at Ortebello to endeavor to get what he wanted by any stratagem possible. Turr told the commandant a bold lie to the effect that he had the King's permission to get the ammunition. He succeeded, by additional lies, in inducing the officer to hand over the supplies. The expedition was successful; and it is worth while to reproduce Turr's own story of what ensued in order to understand the double-dealing of Victor Emmanuel and his Ministers, and the discreditable connection that existed between these lofty personages and the cutthroats who accompanied the hero of the red shirt:

"Passing through Turin, I heard that the commandant of the fortress of Ortebello had been arrested and shut up in the fortress of Alessandria. I instantly went to His Majesty King Victor Emmanuel, and said to him: 'If any one deserved imprisonment it was myself, for it was I who led the commandant into error, making him believe that we were acting under your Majesty's orders.' The

King said, with one of his short laughs: 'Perfectly true; I have got to square accounts with you, for you have robbed me of one of my fortresses.' But I answered: 'We have given your Majesty the crown of Sicily, and presently will follow the crown of Naples!'

"The King promised with a smile that no harm should come to the commandant. He then told me to speak to the War Minister, General Fanti. To him I gave an accurate description of the way we had got the ammunition, and I obtained from him the assurance that no proceedings whatever should be taken against General Giorgini."

Once again the revolution was installed in power in Sicily, and Garibaldi put Crispi at the head of the temporary government there, as a reward for his valuable assistance. He was too radical, however, even for radicals, and he turned not only the conservative party but the moderates as well against him by his arbitrary behavior. He was thus early beginning that gradual process of metamorphosis whose finish was to behold the conversion of a red republican of the most uncompromising type turned into an out-and-out supporter of monarchy and a foe to all those secret associations whose help had been found so valuable in the realization of his daring ambitions. As long as Cavour lived he kept at a distance, but a little while after his death he boldly threw off the mask of republicanism and professed himself an adherent of the house of Piedmont. "The monarchy unites us," he said; "the republic would divide us." His brother in arms, Garibaldi, practically did the same when he accepted a pension from the King. We may smile at their tergiversation and their duplicity, but were they any worse than what we beheld in the case of Victor Emmanuel and his subtle Minister, the profound Cavour?

It is not our purpose to follow the career of this curious political adventurer, even in a cursory way, only to draw from its more salient phases the lessons of hypocrisy and fraud by means of which the outside world was imposed upon regarding the real nature of the Italian designs upon the Papacy and the perfidy which attended their realization. The man's life was a succession of conspiracies. When there were no longer any Bourbons to conspire against he conspired against the Moderate party with the help of the Reds; and when he joined the Monarchists he spent the remainder of his life in conspiracies against the power of the Reds. His bitterest enemies, for years, were the two men with whose help he scrambled to power—Mazzini and Garibaldi—and the wonder is how he escaped the fate of those disciples of the dagger who retire from business or turn against their companions in guilt. There is no doubt that he ran great risks and was the recipient of many threatening letters, and at

least on one occasion a serious attempt was made upon his life. But the proverbial longevity of threatened men was vividly realized in his case, and it would seem that the length of years vouchsafed him was a providential opportunity afforded him to repent of an evil career and turn toward a merciful Redeemer, only to be condemned and thrown away. Crispi's inordinate egotism it was, seemingly, that prevented him from repenting of his exceptionally sinful life. He believed he was born to be a leader of men, and so it was that when he was called on to take a place in the Italian Cabinet for the first time it was no easy matter to get him to work in harness. It may be said that all great men have had a strong sense of their own importance, but that fact does not make it a converse truth that all men of excessive vanity are entitled to be regarded as great. Richelieu was a vain man who was truly great, for he saved and reorganized his country. Crispi, on the other hand, brought his country to the verge of ruin, and brought disgrace upon himself, and with all this stolidly preserved his egotism to the last.

Next to this unconquerable personal defect, the trait which predominated most with Crispi was a fanatical anti-clericalism. Most of the men who ranged themselves under Garibaldi's banner had a tiger hatred of Church and Pope and priest, yet it might not be the truth to describe them all as atheists. But Crispi differed in nothing from an atheist. Long association with men of murder and intrigue had obliterated every trace of that religious instruction he had imbibed in his childhood. In his old age he manifested some tendencies toward a reconciliation with the Papacy, but this was only a deceptive move, made to cover some hidden purpose which never came to light, because a storm was then brewing which was destined to hurl the intriguer to irretrievable ruin. It was shortly before the Roman Bank scandal. Possibly Crispi had an instinctive sense of the danger which was looming in the immediate future, and he may have dreamed that an arrangement with the Holy See, if such could be effected, might be the only possible way of safety for him when his gigantic malfeasances must inevitably be brought to light.

Looking back now, over the chasm of half a century, it must be evident that were it not for the counsels of the violent party the destiny of Italy might have been peaceably arranged and a grand dream of the ages realized in the formation of a new and majestic empire in the form of a confederation of all the Italian States with the Papacy as the centre and bond of unity.

When the illustrious Pontiff Pius IX. acceded to the Chair of Peter, he was hailed by Europe and America as the saviour of the situation in the distracted Italian peninsula. "The man of the age," as he was styled, was known to be fully in accord with the national

aspirations of the Italian people and with the object of uplifting the masses from the feudal slough and the clinging weeds of a worn-out system. His fame as a reformer had been so noised abroad, his personal character had been so widely eulogized, that the highest hopes of a new era for Italy under his glorious reign found universal expression. Meetings with this object were held in the chief capitals, amongst others in New York. In the address thereat adopted, the Pope was described as one who had succeeded in uniting revolution with prescription, progress with stability and the energy of youth with the majesty of immemorial antiquity. The dream of the new Pontiff, as revealed in word and act, was truly ethereal. He deemed it possible to inaugurate a new era, wherein love would be the soul of the State and kindness the only force that would be necessary to compel obedience to law. He stemmed the torrent of revolution which he found raging at his feet by issuing, in opposition to the advice of his Council, the decree of amnesty headed "Proprio Motu." By virtue of this decree all those who had been imprisoned for political offenses in the preceding Pontificate, as well as all those who had been exiled or disqualified, were set free on their own bond to behave as orderly and dutiful citizens in the future. This totally unexpected act of generosity threw Rome into a frenzy of joy, and the Pope was everywhere hailed as the ideal ruler and Pontiff. But these golden opinions of a fickle populace proved to be ephemeral. Artful and treacherous men abounded, violent men upon whom all gentleness was wasted—men of whom Gioberti may be taken as type in subtlety of guile and disloyalty of action. Gioberti is to many minds even yet a mystery, so inconsistent had been his action when in power in Sardinia with his professions and his theories regarding the Sovereign Pontiff and the place of the Holy See in the governmental orrery. While denying that civil society had the right to emancipate itself from ecclesiastical supremacy by means of violence, he was yet surrounded by a crowd of enthusiasts of the school of Young Italy—Mazzinians and leaders of other revolutionary circles, all bent upon overthrowing the Papacy and making the Democracy the masters of the Pope and the real rulers of the Papal Court. All this double-dealing was sugared over with the coating of a philosophy so plausible as to remain to the present hour a source of perplexity to the most experienced in dialectics as to its real character. It is difficult to decide, when all things are weighed, whether the Papacy has not more reason to dread the influence of men like Gioberti, with their fair exterior, than the undisguised enemy of profligates like Crispi.

It is something like the converse of Dante's progress through the hidden world when one seeks to follow the circles of development in

Italian unification. The climbing is not upward. The movement which began in romance and pathetic biography grew into the semblance of philosophy, and the endeavor to crystallize the philosophy into action as a working system proved it to be empiric, so direful have been its results. Philosophy and conspiracy are impracticable yoke-fellows. When we survey Crispi, the typical embodiment of this pseudo-philosophy, in his character as it stands stripped by the unsparing hand of history, it is possible to imagine how the novel of "Frankenstein" may have been a prophetic prefigurement of the outcome of Italy's political travail in those days of agony.

While the whole American nation is quivering under the blow of an assassin, it is useful to recall that its press had nothing but regret when the news of Crispi's demise came, and Crispi was of the cult of political assassination, and it was by the help of assassins he climbed to fame and opulence. In the house of an English resident named Pearse, in Palermo, masquerading as a commercial personage, he superintended the manufacture of bombs for the destruction of the Sardinian monarch's supporters, and showed his companions how to use them. This fact he used to speak of himself. He was one of those arrested in Paris in connection with Orisini's plot to blow up Louis Napoleon, but as he was careful to destroy all letters referring to such things, according to an understanding with Mazzini, the police were unable to connect him with the outrage when it was perpetrated. His signature was openly affixed to a proclamation offering, on the part of the revolutionary government in Sicily, a reward of ten thousand ducats for the assassination of King Ferdinand, declaring that political homicide is no crime. Is it to be wondered at that such lessons bore fruit in time? When the apt scholars to whom they were addressed turned them to account against the teachers themselves, they did but apply the principles of Mazzini's philosophy to the conditions which had most immediate concern for themselves. Victor Emmanuel made a pact with assassination when he condoned the filibustering raids of Garibaldi on Sicily and the States of the Church; and when Garibaldi's lieutenant, Crispi, became a renegade to the Revolution and espoused the cause of the Monarchy, nothing could be more of course than the application of the methods of the Revolution to the situation thus created. Automatically, so to speak, the machinery of the *accoltelatori*, began to work, and if Crispi contrived to escape the fate that overtook King Humbert, it was not because he was less the object of vengeance than the doomed son of Victor Emmanuel.

Why is it, when men are casting about for reasons why anarchy is synonymous with murder, that the true genesis of the dread monster is not traced? No story is simpler, if those who profess to be

in search of it will only read what is written. The principles of anarchy are old, but the practical adaptation of them to modern conditions is so interwoven with the story of United Italy as to be inseparable. It was under the shelter of England that the horrid incubation was made a success. Crispi was the example of anarchy successful in seeking rehabilitation as applied philosophy.

Hatred of the Papacy did not mean merely, in the case of Crispi and his associate Garibaldi, hatred of it as a politico-religious system. It meant a passionate fury against the whole religious idea, and especially against the Catholic idea. This rabies is strikingly illustrated in the history of the Bruno incident. Herein is a point upon which Crispi's admirers in the English-speaking secular press are singularly silent. That press would fain pose as respectable in its attitude toward religion. Therefore, in its survey of Crispi's career, the Bruno incident was allowed to drop out of sight. Was this silence that of charity, or was it prompted by the same motive which slurred over Crispi's connection with the men of the dagger and the hand grenade?

Crispi, if he had any notions of religion at all, appears to have some leanings toward the pantheism of the "Naturalists." At all events he believed that Christianity, if it ever had any useful purpose in the modern dispensation, was played out, and must be abolished if the car of civilization were not to be impeded in its beneficent progress. The struggle between civilization and Christianity, he declared through his mouthpiece, Signor Bovio, had been going on for fifteen centuries, and the day of victory for the former had dawned with the inauguration of the Bruno memorial. The philosophy of Nature was to take the place of the philosophy of Christ; there were to be thenceforth nor priesthood, nor creed, nor temple; the Church of the Universe, into which all men should freely enter, was to take the place of the Catholic Church which has Rome for its centre, and no man evermore should be excommunicated for holding any doctrine or holding no doctrine at all. These were Crispi's religious sentiments, as interpreted by his friend, Bovio. They are Shelley's without the poetical envelope—and Shelley got the burial of an atheist and a heretic.

If there was a woful decline from the beginnings of New Italy to its consummation, in the matter of religious faith, not less conspicuous was the contrast presented with regard to private morality. Men who spurn God have usually little squeamishness about spurning social canons. Garibaldi and Crispi were notoriously profligates in their private lives. In the case of Garibaldi this fact might not have mattered much, so far as his relation to politics was concerned. But in Crispi's position it became a consideration of some consequence.

He was thrust into prominence wherein social standing and behavior was an element that could not but count for something, and his shameful connections affected his own fortunes and brought menace and discredit to the country which he professed to serve with a patriot fervor.

The basest of profligates who live upon the wages of sin could not have eclipsed the statesman who is called great in his ingratitude toward the victims whom he made his providers. In this respect there was a striking resemblance between Garibaldi and Crispi. Still, Garibaldi was not guilty of the baseness of deserting the woman who followed him as a faithful dog, after she had deserted her lawful husband; they clung to each other until he was a fugitive outcast, and she died in the woods near Ravenna, and he left some directions when dying that showed he cherished her memory. But not so with Crispi. The woman whom he married on the second occasion, and who roughed it with him in all his campaigning in the field and conspiring in the wineshop, he basely deserted when his fortunes brightened, and secretly married another. This scandal was too much. The Queen, it was said, stirred Crispi's parliamentary enemy, Nicotera, to take action in the matter; he attacked him in his paper, the *Bersagliere*, and so palpable was the case that there was nothing for it but to set the law in motion against the hardened offender. Crispi was prosecuted for bigamy, although in reality his offense was more, and he got out of the scrape by the following specimen of Italian legal finesse: "When Signor Crispi married for the third time, his first wife was dead; his second marriage was illegal, because it was contracted during the first wife's lifetime; his third marriage, therefore, is legal." This third marriage proved his undoing. His third wife was an ambitious, robust-minded female. Her influence on his fortunes is thus sketched by the late Mr. Stillman, the intimate personal friend of Crispi and Roman correspondent of the *London Times*:

At the receptions of the Queen, Signora Crispi, who was really an antipathetic person, had her seat in the Royal circle, where she sat as completely ignored by all present as if she were a statue of Aversion. I am convinced that the larger part of animosity shown for Crispi by the better classes in Rome was due to her. On one occasion I heard General — (one of the Thousand) saying to another person: "Poor Crispi, he has not a friend in the world." "Nonsense, he has thousands of friends," replied the other. "No," returned the General, "if Crispi had one friend he would kill that woman."

Signora Crispi had more than ambition; she had a great itching for money, like most other ambitious people; and Crispi, the master of men, in some unaccountable way, became the slave of this grasping, designing woman. For her sake he plunged his hands into the coffers of the Banca Romana, and the connection of himself and his interesting family, the relatives and hangers-on of Donna Lina, with

that bank and with several other banking institutions, from the time of his third marriage until his disgrace and downfall, was that of the blackmailer and his victim.

Of Crispi's niche in the Valhalla of great statesmen it is not necessary here to speak. If statesmanship consists in bringing one's country to bankruptcy by means of crushing military burdens, the outcome of foreign alliances, then indeed Crispi was a phenomenal success, since the drain of the Triple Alliance in manhood and treasure, as far as Italy is concerned, has been incessant, relentless and utterly barren of good. The overwhelming military disaster at Adowah stands on record as a monument of his maladroitness in the field of colonial compensations. To "scatter plenty o'er a smiling land" was not Crispi's idea of a great Minister's function, but rather to squeeze a poverty-stricken, resourceless land to the last point of human endurance; and this he continued to do until he was at last forced to yield up his office in utter ignominy.

What is the political and social condition of the Italy which Crispi and his policy have created? Professor Fiammingo, in the *Contemporary Review* (September, 1900) gave the world a glimpse. He declares that "everywhere in Italy there is profound discontent and dissatisfaction with a government which extracts two-fifths of the whole earnings of the country in taxation. There is not an Italian," he adds, "who does not attribute the terrible and profound financial calamities of his country to the mistaken action of the government, and the chorus of condemnation against this government, which appears to be doing its best to impoverish thirty-five millions of inhabitants, and to restrict in every possible way their personal liberty, is every day becoming more pronounced, and almost threatening in its intensity. It is difficult now to meet a young Italian of a certain degree of culture who does not style himself a 'literary Anarchist,' or at least a 'Marxian Socialist.'"

Professor Fiammingo does not hesitate to say that brigandage is a secular institution in his country; that there is no other nation with such a criminal record. It has twenty murders for every one committed in England. There were a hundred and fifty regicides during the past century, and two-thirds of these were the work of Italians. It is the curse of militarism which seems to be making brigandage, and famine, too, "secular institutions." In the *Monthly Review* of last July a writer named Edward C. Strutt, in the course of a paper on "Famine in Italy and Its Causes," gives some terribly suggestive details of the effect of the military system on the peasantry. In Sardinia in twelve years and a half, he testifies, no fewer than 52,060 judicial sales of houses and lands took place for non-payment of taxes, or one out of every fourteen inhabitants was

despoiled by government. Out of 445 such sales in the first week of the new century, eighty-five per cent. were for sums less than one lira (10d.) each. Sometimes the amount is as small as five centimes ($\frac{1}{2}$ d.)! Mr. Strutt remarks on the paradox that just "those regions which have been more plentifully endowed with natural wealth, such as Sardinia, Sicily, Calabria and Apulia, are those which now suffer most cruelly." The writer says it would be difficult to find a people more frugal or more easily satisfied than the Pugliese peasantry; and yet, olive-blight, insurrection and savage repression have left them in despair. Life in gaol appears a paradise to the starving, to attain which innumerable crimes are committed where crime was formerly unknown.

No government in the world ever was the target for such vituperation as that of the Papal States prior to the Italian occupation. Corruption and incompetency were said to be its perennial characteristics as a political system, while the condition of the people, oppressed by taxation and grovelling in helpless ignorance, was depicted as the most forlorn and wretched of all European populations. English travelers gave out such tales year after year, while the other side of the picture was as carefully kept from the public vision as the farther hemisphere of the moon. Let us see how the real state of affairs in the Papal territories compared with the conditions of modern Italy as evolved by Depretis and Crispi. Happily we have some data on which we can rely, supplied from a most impartial source. The Count de Tournon, who was appointed by Napoleon, acted as Prefect of Rome and Administrator of the Papal States for the four years from 1810 to 1814. He is described, even by a British authority, as one of those highly intelligent and honorable men whom the conqueror sometimes sent to the countries he had occupied as if to make them some compensation for the evils of military conquest. He has left us a book of the most valuable character, composed with that rare combination of scientific precision and sympathetic observation which makes French descriptive literature so much prized by those in search of style as well as fact. Tournon gives in the most unreserved and unvarnished way a history of the frightful evils caused by the French invasions and the successive abductions of the Popes by the imperious conqueror. He does not spare the French generals who emulated their master in the work of pillage and oppression; and it may well be surmised that it was a fortunate circumstance for the author that the overthrow of Waterloo had taken place before his book was ready for the press, else he must have been made pay the penalty of his candor. He cannot be suspected by any one of any kind of bias in the matter. He was incessantly on the wing throughout the territory, while fulfilling his

trust, observing methods of agriculture, taking statistics of births, marriages and mortality, measuring farms and compiling tables of cost and profit on all kinds of products—making, in fact, a most exhaustive study of Italy's economic state, in the manner of Adam Smith.

The banditti were the great trouble of De Tournon's administration. These gentry had largely increased owing to the French occupation, and De Tournon frankly lays the blame for a large portion of the trouble at the door of the French administration of Rome and Naples. By dismissing the local police, or *sbirri*, the French authorities had thrown so many semi-military men on the world without employment, and these could find nothing to live by save the profession in whose extinction they themselves had formerly been most engaged. These banditti were gradually decimated until, at the close of the French occupation their number was reduced to about fifty. The state of Rome at this time is thus depicted:

"Eight commissioners of police, with a small municipal guard, maintained the city in perfect safety. The lighting of the streets, a measure then introduced into most Italian cities, contributed to the public security. . . . The influence of the parochial clergy and the respectable part of the country people assisted the government in the work of reformation. The peasants and villagers, now sure of protection, understood that it was their interest to aid the magistrates and police in arresting malefactors, a thing they would have spurned before. By these means," the writer concludes, "it was proved that the Roman people could be soon raised to a very high degree in the scale of morality and rendered as humane, mild and orderly as their neighbors of Tuscany. Indeed, there is nothing in the dispositions of the modern Romans opposed to this assumption; they are full of intelligence, having a strong feeling of self-respect; and, although prone to anger under provocation, they are in the common relations of life gentle, benevolent and warm-hearted, and particularly expressive of their gratitude."

This was the state of a peasantry just recovering from the wrongs and alarms of war and the brutal license of an invading army, it must be remembered. Concerning the criminal statistics of the time, De Tournon gives some remarkable figures. In the two years from August, 1811, to September, 1813, there were 2,072 persons tried for offenses in Rome, being at the rate of one to every 1,000 yearly. Another writer had asserted that there were 10,000 criminal cases yearly in the Roman courts, and De Tournon seemed to feel it his duty to remove this false impression of the criminality of the Roman States. Again, the prisons of Rome, he declares, were better than in most other towns of Europe. Charitable societies,

confraternite, supply the indigent prisoners with food and raiment, and are a useful check on the avarice or tyranny of jailors. Regarding the much-maligned Inquisition, or Holy Office, in Rome, this is what the author has to say :

"When the French took possession of Rome they found the prison of the Inquisition nearly empty—it had been so for many years before)—and nothing in the regulations or internal arrangements of the house showed that it had been the scene of any act of cruelty ; on the contrary, the comfortable size of the apartments intended for the prisoners, their airiness and cleanliness, bespoke the humanity of those who presided over the establishment. It may be asserted that the Holy Office in Rome is nothing more than an ecclesiastical tribunal to check any misconduct of the clergy themselves."

The hospitals and benevolent institutions in Rome at this time are minutely described and enthusiastically dwelt upon by De Tournon. They sheltered, when the French entered the city 3,500 helpless beings. He states their income thus :

	Francs.		Francs.
Rent of lands.....	331,399	Various receipts, donations, etc..	95,622
Rent of houses.....	230,390	Produce of labor of inmates.....	22,000
Mortgage, fees, etc.....	169,989	Credits on the State.....	332,000

The population of the city, at that period, owing to the absence of the Popes and the French invasion, had dwindled down to 123,000.

Concerning the so-called tyrannical sway of the Papacy, the author gives some very remarkable illustrations of the fallacy. For instance, he says :

"There is a congregation called *del Buon Governo*, which is independent of Ministers ; it is presided over by a Cardinal Prefect, and composed of Cardinals and prelates ; it superintends the communal administrations, watches the interests of the communes, and often takes their part against the pretensions of government—a very remarkable institution," he remarks, "under an absolute government." A very liberal system throughout, indeed, seems to have been this "absolute government" of the Papal States. "The towns and villages have each a municipal council. . . . The members are taken in equal proportions from the nobles and from the citizens and farmers. . . . The council discusses the wants and the means of the commune, and makes out the yearly budget, which is sent to the delegate of the province for approval. The council fixes the rates to be paid, superintends the expenditure and audits the accounts. It appoints the servants of the commune, pays the local police, the schoolmaster, the apothecary and surgeon, who receive a fixed remuneration, and are obliged to attend gratis all the poor inhabitants. This system of municipal administration," goes

on De Tournon, "will surprise those who imagine that in the Papal States everything is left to the will or caprice of the government. Abuses of power are common, no doubt, but the written law is more favorable to the liberties of the people than is commonly supposed."

We could quote much more to show that for many years before the system of local government had been created in England the rule which she forty years later had been denouncing as a barbarous anachronism had set it up throughout the territory known as the States of the Church; and, furthermore, that the people under it were infinitely better off, in a material as well as a moral sense, than the bulk of the Italian population under the sway of United Italy. So much for the statesmanship of Francesco Crispi.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Scientific Chronicle.

BRITISH CONGRESS ON TUBERCULOSIS.

The success of medical science in combating disease depends largely, as is evident, on a knowledge of the causes producing the malady, while preventive medical science is effective in holding it in check only when intelligently directed at the root of the evil. Hope of relief, as far as human means can bring it, is held out in the case of many of the ills that flesh is heir to, for medical science has determined with great accuracy the source whence they spring and is able to point out with precision the best method of prevention. A summary of a few important cases will be of interest. These are recalled by Dr. Koch in his address to the congress.

The old theory of the transmission of pestilence was that the plague patient was the centre of infection and transmitted the disease directly to other patients. On this theory the arrangements for preventing the spread of the dread bubonic plague were based. Now, however, it is known that only those patients who have plague-pneumonia are centres of infection and that the real transmitters of the plague are the rats. Hence is it that the application of anti-toxic serum and protective inoculation have had such little effect in preventing the spread of the plague. There is no longer any doubt that the spread of the plague was due to plague among the ship rats. Wherever the rats were exterminated the plague rapidly disappeared, wherever this precaution was not taken the pestilence continued.

Cholera may under certain conditions be transmitted from one human being to another, but the most dangerous propagator is water. Therefore the proper manner of fighting the disease is by preventing the use of polluted water.

An outbreak of hydrophobia is prevented in an infected person by inoculation, but this does not prevent the infection itself. This can be secured only by compulsory muzzling of all dogs.

Leprosy is a parasitic disease and is transmitted only from person to person when they come into close contact in small dwellings and bedrooms. As immediate transmission plays the important part, the way to combat the disease is to prevent the too close contact of the sick and the healthy. By isolation of the infected in leper houses during the Middle Ages the disease, which had spread to an alarming degree, was stamped out of Central Europe.

The methods suggested in the case of these diseases have proved effective; therefore we look forward to the direct method of attacking other formidable diseases at their origin as the best method of bringing relief to suffering humanity.

Keeping in view the progress that has been made in the study of the causes of diseases and the satisfactory results that have been achieved by attacking these causes, Professor Robert Koch outlined the course that he judged proper for the treatment of consumption, in an address delivered before the British Congress on Tuberculosis, on July 23 last.

From the address as it appears in the *Popular Science Monthly* for September and in *Nature* we select the following points of interest to our readers:

We know that the real cause of the disease is a parasite, that is, a visible and palpable enemy which we can pursue and annihilate, just as we can pursue and annihilate other parasitic enemies of mankind. I suppose there is hardly any medical man now who denies the parasitic nature of tuberculosis, and among the non-medical public, too, the knowledge of the nature of the disease has been widely propagated. Now we know that every disease must be treated according to its own special individuality and that the measures to be taken against it must be most accurately adapted to its special nature, to its etiology.

In by far the majority of cases of tuberculosis the disease has its seat in the lungs, and has also begun there. From this fact it is justly concluded that the germs of the disease—the tubercle bacilli—must have got into the lungs by inhalation. As to the question where the inhaled tubercle bacilli have come from there is also no doubt; on the contrary, we know with certainty that they get into the air with the sputum of consumptive patients. This sputum, especially in advanced stages of the disease, almost always contains tubercle bacilli, sometimes in incredible quantities. By coughing and even speaking it is flung into the air in little drops, that is, in a moist condition, and can at once infect persons who happen to be near the coughers. But then it may also be pulverized when dry, in the linen or on the floor, for instance, and get into the air in the form of dust. The sputum of consumptive people, then, is to be regarded as the main source of the infection of tuberculosis.

Dr. Koch then discusses the question of other sources of the disease and his conclusions are thus summed up: Great importance used to be attached to the hereditary transmission of tuberculosis. Now, however, it has been demonstrated by thorough investigation that though hereditary tuberculosis is not absolutely non-existent, it is nevertheless extremely rare, and we are at liberty, in considering

our practical measures, to leave this form of origination entirely out of account.

Genuine tuberculosis has hitherto been observed in almost all domestic animals, and most frequently in poultry and cattle. From a large number of experiments made under his own direction Dr. Koch is of opinion that bovine tuberculosis, which is the only form that has been considered dangerous to man, differs from human tuberculosis and that the latter cannot be transmitted to cattle. Important as this question is, it is far more important to know if bovine tuberculosis can be transmitted to man. Most medical men believe that it is transmitted. In attacking this question Dr. Koch referred to the fact that here direct experiment is not possible, as in the former case. The experiment is, however, made daily by millions of people, who unintentionally consume in meat and milk virulent and living bacilli of bovine tuberculosis. This being so, Dr. Koch contends that a great many cases of tuberculosis caused by the consumption of alimenta should occur among the inhabitants of large cities, especially among the children. He holds, however, that this is not the case. The Doctor contends that a case of tuberculosis caused by alimenta can be assumed with certainty only when the intestine suffers first, that is, when a so-called primary tuberculosis of the intestine is found. He cites from his own experience and from hospital records of such cases to show how few they are, and adds that it is just as likely that they were caused by the widely-propagated bacilli of human tuberculosis, which may have got into the digestive canal in some way or other, for instance, by swallowing saliva of the mouth.

Dr. Koch holds that now it is possible to determine whether the tuberculosis of the intestine is of human or animal origin. All that need be done is to inoculate cattle with a culture of the bacilli, and if it be bovine tuberculosis, they will be attacked by it; if human tuberculosis, they will not be affected. So strongly convinced is he of his view, that tuberculosis is not transmitted from cattle to man, that he does not deem it necessary to take any measures against it. This is a complete change from the original position of Dr. Koch, that bovine and human tubercle were practically identical.

This change of view aroused great interest, and as the new position can only be assailed by the production of positive evidence that bovine tuberculosis is communicable to man, it was the source of much interest to have such evidence brought forward by Dr. Ravenal, of Philadelphia. He brought forward three cases of such infection that had fallen under his observation. He stated that death had resulted in one of these cases, and in another the bovine tubercle bacillus was recovered from the local lesion. As there was doubt

cast on the position taken by Dr. Koch, it was agreed that further investigation was absolutely necessary and that the present vigilance exercised in the inspection of meat, milk and butter should not be in the least relaxed until more conclusive results were reached.

The Congress was a great success and far surpassed the expectations of the organizers. The effect of the meeting was manifest in the resolutions presented at its close. They may be thus summed up: To prevent tuberculosis it is necessary to attend to the housing of the people, to the provision of a sufficient supply of fresh air, as good nutrition as possible, and to the prevention of the dissemination of the tubercle bacillus. For this purpose proper care should be taken to have it collected and destroyed as soon as it comes from the patient. To cure consumption, fresh air, good food and well-regulated exercise are required.

ELECTRICITY AT THE PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION.

Probably the most interesting feature of the Buffalo Exposition, to the student of mechanical engineering, is the comparison, intentional or otherwise, of the development, transmission and utilization of power by water, gas, steam, compressed air and electricity. While all these different sources of power are well represented, it is clear that electricity had the advantage in a contest which was waged so close to the great electrical plant at Niagara Falls.

The ordinary visitor, however, is most impressed with the electrical illumination of the Grand Court. This Court covers 1,390,000 square feet and is therefore equal in extent to the like features of the Chicago and Paris Expositions combined. The grounds, buildings and electric tower are illuminated by using for that purpose 5,000 horse-power of the energy from Niagara Falls. The power generated at the Falls, by the Niagara Falls Power Company, is a two-phase alternating current of 25 cycles at 2,200 volts. It is at once transformed to a 22,000 volt three-phase current and transmitted twenty miles over copper and aluminum lines to Buffalo. At the city station, on Ontario street, the voltage is reduced to 11,000 and the current then sent about two miles to the rheostat house near one of the entrances to the Exposition grounds. In the rheostat house there are three large water rheostats, each measuring 7 feet long, 3 wide and 3 deep. Blades 6 feet long, which may be lowered into the tanks by a small direct current motor, serve to bring the lamps slowly up to full brilliancy, when metallic contact is made at the bottom of

the tanks. These resistance tanks may be operated from the Electricity Building.

From the rheostat house the current is transmitted to the transforming sub-station in the Electricity Building. At this station 18 air-blast transformers reduce the voltage of the current to 1,800. Thence the current goes to about 40 transformer-pits, scattered about the grounds, where the voltage is brought down to 104 for the incandescent lamps that are used for illuminating the grounds.

The electricity from Niagara is used chiefly for the exterior incandescent decorative lighting. The only other use made of it is the alternating current series arc lighting of the Electricity Building.

The decorative lighting of the grounds is accomplished by 800 artistically designed lamp-posts with from 12 to 26 eight candle-power incandescent lamps on the smaller ones and 59 on the larger posts. The illumination is increased by the rows of electric lamps that cluster along the prominent lines of the high structures that surround the Grand Court, and the lights on the mammoth electric tower are the culmination of a magnificent scene of exterior illumination by incandescent lamps, marking the furthest advance and most extensive application of this method of illumination.

The success of this method at Buffalo has undoubtedly settled the question for all future occasions where illumination on a large scale will be required. Heretofore a combination of arc and incandescent lights with gas-light was employed. This combination did not produce the smooth uniform illumination which is characteristic of the Pan-American. This uniform distribution of light was secured by a minute sub-division and multiplication of the units of illumination. No unit larger than an eight or a sixteen candle-power incandescent lamp was employed. These were arranged in coronet or crescent form so as to avoid massing. The only exception to this arrangement was in the Court of Fountains, where there were clusters in imitation of a flambeau. Here there was a glare of light in the line of sight which marred slightly the evenness of the illumination. In such a scheme of general illumination the eye can endure points of light of eight or sixteen candle-power. If, however, a brilliant cluster or an arc light is in the line of vision the eye is so impressed by looking at this exceptionally brilliant point that the less brilliantly lighted places seem dark and like shadows, thus destroying the evenness of the illumination. It was the avoiding in general of such intensely brilliant points by the sub-division of the illuminating units that secured the uniformly bright illumination which was so greatly admired at the Pan-American Exposition.

The size and number of the great engineering projects which, from every part of the continent, claimed a place in this Exposition, could

be satisfied only by representing them in model. Hence representation by model is a striking feature of this Exposition. Large central engines with long lines of shafting are as a rule absent from this exhibition, and as electricity is used as the driving power they are more artistically placed and conformity with the architectural design is secured.

Although we have referred in a special way to the use of electricity for lighting purposes, its application to power service is represented in more varied ways at the Exposition. Electric motors of varied styles and embodying new departures in the application of the electric current, electric pumping, both by alternating and direct current, electric elevators and hoists, electric traction, electric brakes and car-heating apparatus, electrically propelled vehicles and launches, electrically operated control for steam engines, electric train lighting, telegraph, telephone and X-ray exhibits indicate a few of the ways in which the visitor is impressed with the important part electricity plays in the service of man.

This, however, gives but a very faint idea of the immense power of electricity as shown within twenty miles of the Exposition. This growing centre of industry, made possible by converting the power of Niagara into electricity, must be regarded as a part of the exhibit. 25,000 horse-power in the form of electrical energy is used in the calcium carbide, graphite, carborundum and emery products. The electro-chemical industries use 3,600 horse-power, while the electro-metallurgical industries at present require 5,700 horse-power. Such is the growth of industries around the Falls that the Niagara Falls Power Company is at present doubling the size of its plant.

THE MOSQUITO AND YELLOW FEVER.

The mosquito has been convicted as the "intermediate host" in transmitting malaria and therefore the only way to fight the disease intelligently is to prevent the mosquito from being infected. This same vigilance must now be used in fighting yellow fever, for the report of the Havana Yellow Fever Commission shows that this same insect acts as the "intermediate host" or medium of propagating this disease.

The evidence in the case is clearly summed up in an article in the *Popular Science Monthly* by George M. Sternberg, Surgeon General U. S. A. From the reports of this committee it is evident that the

greatest care has been taken to secure only results that will stand the most severe examination.

Some extracts from the report issued from Headquarters Department, Cuba, will give a good idea of the conclusions arrived at. "So far as yellow fever is concerned, infection of a room or building simply means that it contains infected mosquitoes, that is, mosquitoes which have fed on yellow fever patients. Disinfection, therefore, means the employment of measures aimed at the destruction of these mosquitoes. The most effective of these measures is fumigation, either with sulphur, formaldehyde or insect powder. The fumes of sulphur are the quickest and most effective insecticide, but are otherwise objectionable. Formaldehyde gas is quite effective if the infected rooms are kept closed and sealed for two or three hours. The smoke of insect powder has also been proved very useful; it readily stupifies the mosquitoes, which drop to the floor and can then be readily destroyed. The washing of walls, floors, ceilings and furniture with disinfectants is unnecessary.

"As it has been demonstrated that yellow fever cannot be conveyed by fomites, such as bedding, clothing, effects and baggage, they need not be subjected to any special disinfection. Care should be taken, however, not to remove them from the infected rooms until after formaldehyde fumigation, so that they may not harbor infected mosquitoes.

"Medical officers taking care of yellow fever patients need not be isolated; they can attend other patients and associate with non-immunes with perfect safety to the garrison. Nurses and attendants taking care of yellow fever patients shall remain isolated so as to avoid any possible danger of their conveying mosquitoes from patients to non-immunes.

"The infection of mosquitoes is likely to take place during the first two or three days of the disease. It is therefore essential that all fever cases should be at once isolated and so protected that no mosquitoes can possibly get access to them until the nature of the fever is positively determined. Patients not ill enough to take to their beds and remaining unsuspected and unprotected are probably those most responsible for the spread of the disease.

"All persons coming from an infected locality to a post shall be kept under careful observation until the completion of five days from the time of possible infection, either in a special detention camp or in their own quarters; in either case their temperature should be taken twice a day during this period of observation so that those who develop yellow fever may be placed under treatment at the very inception of the disease."

From the investigations of this committee it seems evident that a

mosquito that has fed on the blood of a yellow fever patient is not dangerous at all times following its infection, but a certain period of incubation is required in the body of the insect before the germ reaches its salivary glands and consequently before it is able to inoculate an individual with the germs of yellow fever. This period is put at from ten to twelve days.

To test whether yellow fever was transmitted by fomites a special building was constructed. This building was mosquito proof and in it were placed three large boxes filled with sheets, pillow slips, blankets, etc., contaminated by contact with cases of yellow fever and their discharges were received and placed therein. On the 30th of November, 1900, Dr. R. P. Cooke and two privates of the hospital corps, all non-immunes, entered the building, opened the boxes, giving each article a thorough shaking. They then hung the articles around the room and slept in the room that night. This operation was repeated for twenty days and nights, and these non-immunes did not contract the fever. This building was afterwards occupied by other non-immunes with like results.

To complete the proof a second building was erected and every possible source of infection was removed. The building was divided into two compartments by a mosquito-proof wiring. On one side of the partition a non-immune and on the other two non-immunes were placed. In the compartment in which the one non-immune was fifteen mosquitoes which had previously fed on yellow fever patients were freed. This man was bitten by these mosquitoes. For three days he was bitten by these insects and contracted yellow fever. The two others who lived under the same conditions, minus the mosquitoes, did not contract the fever.

This brief account of some of the methods of investigation shows how thoroughly the work has been done and the value attaching to the published results.

THE NERNST ELECTRIC LAMP.

The exhibit of Nernst lamps in the Electricity Building at the Pan-American Exposition is the first public exhibit of the lamp in the United States. In experimental form it was shown at the Paris Exhibition. At the Pan-American the lamp has passed the experimental stage and is showing by actual work what it is capable of doing. In the grand dome of the Electricity Building and around the Westinghouse exhibit it produces magnificent lighting effects. The color value of the lamp is superior to that of any other electric

light. It is practically equal to sunlight in enabling one to match or detect delicate shades or tints in fabrics or other material.

The steady improvement in the Nernst lamp dates from 1898, when Dr. Nernst, the inventor, came to this country and exhibited his lamp before Mr. George Westinghouse, at Pittsburg. The latter, holding the right for the United States, engaged a number of competent electrical engineers to develop the lamp, and the present perfected lamp is the result.

The source of light in the Nernst lamp is a glowing rod of rare earths. It is made by expressing from a die a paste made of rare earths. It is cut into suitable lengths, dried and roasted. This rod of enamel measures about one and one-half inches in length and one-thirty-second of an inch in diameter. A platinum bead is imbedded in each end of the rod and to these beads the wires can be easily fused.

This glower, as it is called, is a non-conductor when cold, but becomes a conductor when heated. It is therefore necessary to heat the glower to bring it to a conducting temperature. In the first lamps the inventor did this by means of an alcohol lamp or even by a match. He also employed electric heaters. The glower is lighted at a temperature of about 950 degrees C. To secure this temperature in the present lamp the heater employed consists of a thin porcelain tube, around which a fine platinum wire is wound and pasted with cement. The paste serves to protect the wire from the intense heat of the glower. These tubes are wound for 110 volts and are connected by pairs in series according to the service required. The life of a heater when running constantly is about 200 hours. This indicates a long life in actual service, for each time the lamp is lighted the heater is used for about 30 seconds only.

As the temperature of the glower rises its conductivity increases. The voltage across the terminals of the glower also increases, at first rapidly, and then more slowly, until it reaches a maximum. Then it falls off as the current and temperature increase. This decrease after maximum is so rapid that it makes it difficult to control the current. To meet this difficulty a steadying resistance has been introduced. This consists of an iron wire mounted in a glass tube which contains some inert gas. Under normal conditions the resistance of the iron wire is a minimum, and throughout the high corrective region the wire can be worked, as there is no danger of its destruction, since oxygen is excluded. The protection this ballast gives the glower is evident, when for a ten per cent. rise in current the resistance of the ballast increases 150 per cent. In series with this regulator and the glower is the control magnet of the heater. When the current flows through the regulator and the glower it

passes through the control magnet and cuts out the heater when the lamp has been brought into service.

This lamp works with alternating currents, and when such currents are used there is no electrolytic action observable in the glower. Improvements are being made in the lamp for use with direct currents. When such currents are employed the glower acts as a true electrolyte, there being a black deposit on the negative end of the glower which rapidly extends to the positive end and reduces the efficiency of the glower. The life of the glower is, as determined by actual service, 800 hours. This is about double the life of an incandescent lamp of lowest watt consumption and of equivalent candle-power. The unit for lamps is the single 50 candle-power glower, and by multiplying the number of glowers a lamp of any desired efficiency may be had.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Notices.

INSTITUTIONES METAPHYSICAE SPECIALIS, quas tradiderat in Collegio Maximo Lovaniensi. *P. Stanislaus De Backer, S. J.* T. II., Psychologia. Pars. I., De Vita Organica. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie., 83 Rue de Rennes. 1901, pp. 266.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHIAE MORALIS ET SOCIALIS, quas in Collegio Maximo Lovaniensi tradiderat. *A. Castelein, S. J.* Bruxelles: Schepens & Cie., 18 Rue Treurenberg, pp. 662.

There are obviously good grounds for that point of view adopted by some recent Catholic philosophers which restricts psychology to the philosophy of the human soul. This position escapes on the one hand the necessity of expending energy in the study of living organism inferior to man, and on the other hand avoids the recent mutilation of psychology which results from confining it to the classification and surface analysis of merely psychical phenomena.

There are, however, no less potent arguments in favor of that broader conception which defines psychology as the philosophy of the *soul*, taking the latter term in its widest Aristotelian sense for the root principle of life in an organism including therefore the plant and the animal. The human soul is more than the basal principle of intelligence and will. It is the source of all vital activity within the body, vegetation as well as sentience. The higher spiritual functions and hence the nature itself of the rational soul cannot be scientifically explained unless its vegetative and sentient powers and activities are understood. These, however, will be most satisfactorily explained by investigating the operations and principle of life in the plant and animal. Father De Backer has wisely, we think, accepted the peripatetic definition of psychology as the *scientia* (philosophica) *de anima*, and has accordingly made two distinct parts in the treatment of his subject, one devoted to the organic, the other to the super-organic life. The present volume deals with organic life in the plant and the animal. These organisms are studied philosophically, of course, that is, as to the essential nature of their informing principle of vitality and in interest of the light they throw upon the working and nature of the human soul—the noblest principle of life in the world of organisms. But whilst adhering to this ancient conception of psychology, the author is very far from treating his subject in an antiquated fashion. The main bulk of his argumentation is, of course, to be found in the works of St. Thomas and other eminent scholastics; but in passing through his own mind it has undergone a simplification and clarification and an arrangement that make the reading of his book easy and pleasant as well as

profitable. Moreover, he gladly admits that psychology has advanced in recent times, especially on the side of physiological phenomena. These modern developments he has assimilated and accorded them their place in the scholastic system. Students who have acquired their knowledge of psychology from the manuals published a generation ago will probably be surprised at finding in a Latin text-book plates illustrating the microscopy of vegetation, and engravings of the cerebrum, spinal cord, nerve cells and neurons, motor-reflexes, etc. This pictorial apparatus may not be deemed essential to a work on philosophy, but it is certainly helpful to the student and is significant of the development of neo-scholasticism in the direction which is most demanded at the present time—viz., in the sensible facts and empirico-scientific classifications and immediate inferences.

Besides this, another feature will commend the book to the student, viz., the perfect transparency of the style. The author has undertaken a work of magnitude, one which will probably be read most by professors or advanced students. He might, therefore, have easily been tempted to adopt an elevated strain of Latinity. Instead of this, however, he has adhered throughout to that perfectly simple diction which helps to make the works of St. Thomas and the other great schoolmen so luminous and satisfying.

Though treating of a different division of the philosophical system, Father Castelein's "Institutes of Moral Philosophy" may be brought here into connection with the foregoing work because of its similarity of view-point and method. The key to the treatment is set down at the start: *Fontes Philosophiae moralis sunt tum principia tum facta; principia, quibus regitur methodus deductiva et facta quae sunt elementa methodi inductivae*. This standpoint and method—the blending of deduction with induction—gives scientific solidity to the author's system without depriving it of the interest which accompanies the concrete or fact-element. The conclusions demonstrated in theodicy and psychology are unfolded so as to explain, classify and reduce to law the ethical facts which history and experience present. A signal excellence in Father Castelein's work is the prominence given to the subjects about which men's minds are busiest to-day. Though the fundamental and traditional questions of ethics receive their just share of discussion, the actual problems of the hour are treated with special fulness. Thus the questions centering in socialism and the rights of property receive a hundred pages of the book. The wage question, the relation between capital and labor and kindred topics are given proportionate space. An appendix of a hundred pages contains some important and interesting matters regarding the history of socialism, the effects of modern industry on the economic

order, comparative labor statistics, a brief exposition and critique of various recent systems of economics, etc. In compass Father Cas-telein's treatise holds a middle place between the well-known Latin manual of Father Cathrein and the two volumes on the same subject contributed by Father Meyer to the *Cursus Philosophiae Lacensis*. We can give the work no higher commendation than to say that for depth, breadth, orderliness and perspicuity it fully deserves a place by the side of Meyer's *Institutiones* and Cathrein's *Moral Philosophie*.
F. P. S.

MEDITATIONS ON PSALMS PENITENTIAL. By the author of "Meditations on the Psalms of the Little Office." 12mo., pp. vii., 163. St. Louis: B. Herder.

This is one of the most satisfying books of meditation that has come under our notice. Too often such books place before us the particular application of certain truths to the needs of the writer and the result of such application; they appeal to a limited number only. In other books too much attention is given to erudition and too little to spirituality. In them there is more discussion than prayer; they appeal to the head rather than to the heart. But the end of meditation is to move the heart; to bring us to sorrow and love and service. The book before us fulfils these requirements.

The author has chosen his subject well. He has taken those seven songs of the Church that have been the voice of her penance in every age. From the wealth of her treasure in the Psalter she singles them out especially for use in her public affairs and commends them for the private devotion of her faithful children. They bear a message of consolation and hope not only to the sons and daughters of the Church, but to every weary soul that wanders through this vale of tears disappointed, tempted, fallen. They hold up before us the picture of the penitent king who has fallen and risen. "They are deep living wells. The profound spiritual experience which they reveal finds a response in the yearning of every unsatisfied heart; the assured faith of their inspired writer is a beacon light to the perplexed and despondent. In them the true penitent has an inexhaustible fount of devotion; for the contrite soul can find no fitter words wherein to break silence and utter its lamentations before God." The Latin and English text are printed in parallel columns, with a running commentary in English. Then follows a brief sketch of the history of the psalm and then the meditation proper. The meditation is short and the prayer that succeeds it is long. This is exactly as it should be, although we generally find the reverse arrangement. Page after page is enriched with references to other parts of the Sacred Text and to the Fathers. The

writer has caught the spirit of the composer, and this is praise indeed. To all who know the beauty and pathos of the Psalms Penitential we recommend this book that they may know them better; to those who do not know them, we recommend it that they may learn them well.

SYNODORUM ARCHIDIOECESIOS NEO-EBORACENSIS COLLECTIO, Excellentissimi ac Reverendissimi Michaelis Augustini Corrigan Archiepiscopi Jussu Editā. Neo-Eboraci: Typis et Sumptibus Bibliothecae Cathedralis.

This new edition of the synodal decrees of New York was brought out as a memorial of the golden archiepiscopal jubilee of the see. It is a most becoming souvenir, for it shows the development of the diocese during the half century in a striking manner. Its various decrees which regulate the discipline and ceremonial of the Church to suit the requirements of the times without changing them in any essential point, speak to us of phenomenal growth. They tell us of wise, watchful heads, who observed and planned carefully, and of faithful, obedient followers who aided them well in perfecting the work. The successive stages of growth can be followed in the series of synods. The volume will be very useful not only for the priests of New York, where the statutes are in force, but also for the bishops and priests of other dioceses that have not yet fully developed. They will find in it answers to many questions that have not arisen in their own midst, and models for many disciplinary regulations, which experience has shown to be wise and useful. The book is very nicely gotten up, well arranged and well indexed.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. 4 vols., 16mo., half mor., \$6.50. Mechlin: H. Dessain. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1901.

This is the latest and smallest Breviary. It contains all the offices, and it is the most convenient book for those who wish to carry it in the pocket. In shape and appearance and weight it resembles a small *Horae Diurnae*, and at first sight most persons refuse to believe that it is the complete Breviary. The second exclamation of surprise is heard when the book is opened. The paper and type are excellent. It is not true, as it was formerly, that a small book must be printed in type that is almost illegible. The great improvements in paper-making enable the printer to use a type that is comparatively large and remarkably clear. When this book was first announced, many persons expressed doubt as to the possibility of making it useful. Some seemed to think that the limit in compactness had been reached, and that any attempt to go further would prove a failure. Such is not the case. This Breviary is all that the publishers intended it to be—the smallest book of its kind, with excellent paper and type.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

20M-8-46

237

ANNEX

ANNEX

134310

ANNEX

